

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. SELWYN, D.D., REDHILL RECTORY, HAVANT,
to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XV

NOVEMBER, 1927

No. 89

EDITORIAL

"MOTHER INDIA"

EVERY now and then there appears a book which appeals to the thinking public at once as of the first importance, not so much for the new facts which it presents as for the new clues which it offers for old facts or the greater proportions in which it sets them. Otto's *The Idea of the Holy* was such a book, giving us in the category of the "numinous" a new understanding of religion. *Mother India** is a book of the same calibre—unquestionably one of the great books of the year. The authoress, Miss Mayo, is an American lady who went to India with an open mind to see the country and its peoples for herself. This volume gives us the result of her observations, chiselled in outline, richly documented, limpidly written. It is an amazingly truthful picture of what Hinduism has made of India, and still makes of it—of its devastating cruelties and sensualities, its moral and political rottenness, its utter corruption of human nature. We propose to consider its bearing upon some of the problems now confronting us in the East.

And first that which is in itself secondary—the question of the extension in the near future of the Montague-Chelmsford reforms. Miss Mayo scarcely touches on this problem; but a public opinion in England, roused as it is by her book, is bound to feel and to face its reaction upon our political responsibilities in India. In a quite indirect sense—for it is manifestly not one of the purposes of the book—*Mother India* is a powerful vindication of British rule in the peninsula. It is true that the improvement of social conditions to which British policy has been steadily directed in India for over half a century has

* By Katherine Mayo. Jonathan Cape. 10s. 6d. net.

not been an unmixed blessing: for the low-caste Hindu has interpreted the raising of his standard of life as an invitation to ape the customs of the higher castes and to bind on himself and his children heavier burdens—as, for example, in the treatment of widows—than he had been used to before. Much of the educational work of the Government, again, has been frustrated of its fruit, in the primary grades by the impossibility of finding women to teach in the villages, in the higher by the futile and fictitious value which the Indian attaches to a University degree. None the less, the Government of India stands out in these pages as the one agency which steadily, unweariedly, and disinterestedly seeks for India's good; encouraging every practicable reform; exploring every opportunity of social freedom; patiently bearing with slander, betrayal, wilful misrepresentation, until the time comes to move on once more.

And over against it stands the social system of Hinduism—a system of spiritual and moral slavery surely without parallel in the world. The question is, Can we rightly give further power of government to a people so unfit to apprehend or to discharge its duties? The English instinct of fairness will no doubt operate to discount the political bearing of facts which are primarily moral and religious; and it will be urged that little virtue attaches to the bestowal of liberties, if the risk of these liberties being misused is not frankly taken. But the answer is at hand out of the very principles professed. We must be fair; but we must be fair to all. Not least we must be fair to those 60,000,000 Untouchables whose sole hope of a tolerable life lies in the continuance of British rule. One of the most striking chapters of Miss Mayo's book is devoted to the Prince of Wales's visit in 1921, and of his welcome from the Untouchables in Bombay and at Delhi. She describes how the Prince halted his car, while their spokesman addressed him:

The Prince heard him through. Then—whether he realized the magnitude of what he did, or whether he acted merely on the impulse of his natural friendly courtesy toward all the world—he did an unheard-of thing. He stood up—stood up, for them, the “worse than dogs”—spoke a few words of kindness, looked them all over, slowly, and so, with a radiant smile, gave them his salute.

No sun that had risen in India had witnessed such a sight. As the car started on, moving slowly, not to crush them, they went almost mad. And again their Eastern tongues clothed their thought. “Brother—that word was truth that our brothers brought us. Behold, the Light is there indeed! The Light—the Glory—on his face!”

There is a picture of what British rule means to the Untouchables. We may say the same of the alleviations of

child-marriage and widowhood, or of the cruelties practised on animals. British rule alone stands surety for their maintenance. Can we hand the oppressed back again to the oppressor?

But who is the oppressor? This brings us to our second point. We are convinced that *Mother India* will effect a very wholesome revolution in missionary philosophy. For a generation past we have been imbued with the doctrine that one of the main motives of missions is to gather into the Church the spiritual riches of the heathen religions. We have been taught to regard these religions as in their way "schoolmasters to Christ," parts of a world-wide *præparatio evangelica*, rays of light from the one Sun of Truth. So far as Hinduism is concerned, *Mother India* reveals that doctrine to be in large part a delusion. And in doing so it brings us back to the words and ways of Scripture. It reminds us, as the Bible does over and over again, that religion is not in itself a good, but may be the worst of evils; that the saying of the greatest of Rome's poets and thinkers, Lucretius, contains a permanent truth:

Tantum religio potuit suadere malorum;

and that "the things which the Gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice to devils, and not to God." We foresee in the future Christian Missions making this more robust, more direct, appeal—the appeal to take the Lord's side in the warfare against the supernatural forces of evil; the appeal of a great compassion, springing from the compassion of Christ Himself, for those in whatever land who are "fast bound in misery and iron." The Church's message to Hinduism will thus be not one of fulfilment, but of emancipation; of the complete supersession and extinction of the old religion, that the souls of men and women may be re-created in Christ—an extinction as complete as that of Hellenic paganism in the advancing tide of early Christianity.

And next, we ask ourselves what is the bearing of this book on the question of Reunion now before the Church in India. It is a question not easily answered. One's first impulse is to say that, in face of evil of such magnitude as that revealed in *Mother India*, everything which should tend to bring the Christian forces closer together is to be encouraged. One of the keenest impressions made on us by this book is that of the silent and heroic suffering of the English and Scottish women doctors in the midst of the human wreckage all around them—a suffering not physical, but mental and moral, as they see the children they have cared for sent back to their misery and every ideal

of a Christian home spurned and degraded. Surely no nobler band of women ever laboured in Christ's name than the medical missionaries in India. And if that deep moral unity of Christian work and witness in the furnace seeks to annul ecclesiastical barriers which have come to seem unreal, then can the Church at home refuse her blessing to the project? And yet there is another line of thought which may equally occur. Before so vast and monstrous a thing as Hinduism, can anything make headway, in any deep and penetrating sense, except the whole Catholic Faith and Church of Christ? Is it the barriers as such, or is it the principles of schism behind them, that the need of the heathen reproaches? Is it quick remedies, or is it long views, that the situation demands? We state the alternatives broadly, and find it difficult to judge. At least, when judgment comes to be given, the situation presented in *Mother India* is one of the great factors to be taken into account.

Finally, this book should do much, if rightly used, to kindle a flame of prayer for the work of the Church in India. There are Indians who detest the condition to which Hinduism has brought their people no less than we do; and they need our sympathy and our love. No one who has lived long in India, as Fr. Holmes has recently pointed out in the *Church Times*, has failed to recognize real stirrings of the Indian conscience: many can number Indians of rare and beautiful character among their friends. If Hinduism has but little to contribute to Christianity, India has much; and we may well learn there what the West seems unable of itself to learn, that the true riches are those of the soul.

REASON AND CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE

II.—WHAT IS REASON?

IN this article it is our purpose to determine, with such precision as we may, in what sense the truth of religion may be said to be beyond reason, and in what kind of synthesis the rational and the empirical type of apologetic may ultimately be combined.

There is no term which is used with more disastrous ambiguity in modern discussion than the great word *reason*. And the extreme difficulty of disentangling the different senses which the term may bear, and yet holding clearly to the unity of significance which underlies them all, may well daunt the most skilful. Nevertheless some fresh attempt to clear the issues is imperatively required of the modern mind. And, if fools rush in where angels fear to tread, even angelic caution cannot afford to remain permanently outside the arena, and may profit by observing exactly from what cause the fool has come to grief.

Reason, we will assume, is a mode of apprehending reality; and the character of the reality which satisfies its demand is denoted by the term *rationality*. Now the fundamental character of rationality is coherence in some kind of order which would be disturbed or broken if the particular realities which make it up were other than they are either in themselves or in their relations to one another. The perplexity about the use of the terms reason and rationality arises from the fact that various and different principles of order may be called rational, and the mind is constantly liable to pass over from one to another without knowing it.

Even the general description of reason and rationality which we have just given would be much too narrow, if we were attempting to cover every common and legitimate use of the terms. It is theoretical, not practical, reason which is really concerned directly with apprehending rational order. The practical reason uses its knowledge of the ordered way in which things happen, in order to achieve certain results or aims. It is concerned not with apprehending things, but with bringing things to pass by devising means to ends. And from the point of view of practice any act may be called rational which is deliberately performed according to plan with a certain end in view. Of course unless there were a fixed order in the happening of events, which the theoretical reason had already observed, all devising of plans would be futile or impossible, and the practical reason could never get to work. Still the practical reason is distinguished from the theoretical, in the sense that the aim to bring things

to pass is distinguished from the aim to apprehend things in knowledge. Having made this clear, we will at least for the present leave the practical reason out of our discussion altogether.

The reason which we are dealing with, therefore, is the reason which is concerned with truth. It is evident that if truth about reality is attainable at all, there must be some kind of order in reality to start with. But it will still be possible and intelligible to speak of truth beyond reason or even contrary to reason, if the order which we are speaking of as rational is an order which does not, in our opinion, cover the whole field of reality, but belongs only to a part.

What different kinds of order, then, are called rational, and what different modes are there of the reason which apprehends them?

We should, perhaps, place first that principle of reason, commonly called *the law of contradiction*, which is the basis of all intelligible discussion and assertion. Every affirmation, if it means anything at all, must implicitly deny everything which would contradict it. If anyone who enters upon any sort of discussion refuses to be bound by this rule, his assertions will simply have no meaning, and consequently cannot be either true or false. But the mere acceptance of the law of contradiction gives us no positive insight whatever into the nature of reality, and can hardly be said to enable us to apprehend an objective order at all. Its application, important as is the intellectual discipline which it involves, merely ensures that our assertions shall not be meaningless. To ask whether a significant assertion is true or false is a further question, which no law of contradiction can of itself enable us to answer. Reason, therefore, as soon as it is understood to be concerned with the apprehension of any kind of positive truth, cannot consist in the application of a law of contradiction alone. The law states a condition which reason must accept in order to operate at all; but it tells us nothing as to the positive nature of reason or of the order which it apprehends.

The type of positive reason which naturally occurs first to the mind is that which operates in rigid *demonstration* and apprehends the rational order which is completely exhibited in pure *mathematics*. It is generally admitted by modern philosophers that, outside mathematics, rigid demonstration of any truth is unobtainable. The application of mathematical reasonings to facts always involves a certain risk of error, and is never absolutely exact. Philosophers whose ideal of rationality is mathematical are obliged to admit that all truth which can be considered absolute and proved up to the hilt must be cast in a

hypothetical form. We can say, "Granted the truth of a certain hypothesis, then certain consequences must absolutely follow"; but, if we are referring to things actually existent in the world, we can never be quite sure that our hypothesis is altogether true; and observation seems to show that the abstract reasoning of mathematical logic never can be applied to facts without leaving any margin of error at all. The real world exhibits mathematical order sufficiently to make mathematical calculation enormously useful and fruitful in dealing with it. But those for whom mathematical truth is the ideal can find their ideal completely realized only in a world of abstractions; and to allege that the only perfect truth is one which is imperfectly applicable to reality is certainly a paradox of some violence. It is interesting to notice that one of the most celebrated of our mathematical philosophers, Mr. Bertrand Russell, never seems quite able to make up his mind whether the chief business of reason is to make us face the hard facts of the existent world, or to carry us to another world where we can take refuge from facts in the austere joy of contemplating the perfect rationality of mathematics.

Secondly, there is the reason which is the guide of physical *science* and apprehends the rational order of spatio-temporal fact. It certainly cannot be demonstrated that everything which happens in space and time coheres with everything else in a certain order which can be expressed in terms of general laws. Nevertheless the scientific mind, in so far as it is scientific, assumes this to be so, and the impressive achievements of scientific knowledge are constantly adding an ever greater weight of verification to the hypothesis. Even mental events, though their distinct reality is no longer denied, are being brought under the scope of psychological generalizations, as well as closely related to physical processes. And it seems that science in its endeavour to exhibit the coherence of all facts within a spatio-temporal order of existence will never find a bar to its progress, even though its end be never finally attained.

There is certainly a scientific reason and a real rationality of things which it discerns. And it is a reason which does not work wholly by mathematical proof, and a rationality which is not wholly expressible in mathematical formulæ. Its necessity is of a different type. For science does not aim at showing that certain consequences must follow from certain events with such logical rigour that any other sequence would be unthinkable. It is content to show that the sequences of events in fact have obeyed and do obey a certain system or pattern which is so coherent that it is ultimately describable in terms of general laws admitting no real exception. For instance, the scientific reason, in the sphere of medicine, discloses the truth that if

certain chemical substances are introduced into the bloodstream certain effects upon the bodily health will certainly ensue. But it does not attempt to show that the effects *must* ensue with the same kind of necessity with which Euclid tried to demonstrate that the angles at the base of an isosceles triangle are equal. Euclid's proof would be upset if any other conclusion were thinkable. The scientific law would only be upset if it were shown that in a certain case the effect had not occurred.

Now, granted that the assumptions of the scientific reason concerning the order of the world are perfectly valid, so far as they go, it still remains true that they are only all-inclusive, if the whole of reality is made up of events occurring in space-time. And, on the other hand, it is the very inclusiveness of the scientific reason which at this point gives us pause. For, just because the scientific reason aims at including all facts without exception, all facts without exception must in its view be equally rational. Considered as facts, the wildest delusion is as scientifically explicable as the truest of insights, the passionate outburst is as the coldly calculated move, meanness is as heroism, the disaster as the blessing, and so forth. As touching coherence in the order of space-time, there is no difference whatever between truth and error, virtue and vice, good and bad. In this respect the rationality of all is equal and identical. All are equally subject to the generalizations of scientific law. Again we reach a paradox which is an indication that we have kinds of reason and rationality still to mention.

To denote the third type we will employ the term *appreciative*. The appreciative reason apprehends that principle of order in the world whereby things are so arranged as to manifest or embody positive value or goodness. It is evident that, if we take the general mark of rationality to be coherence in a certain order, everything in which we apprehend goodness displays a certain rationality of its own. Beauty depends on harmony, and harmony implies the fitting together of parts. Both the creation and the full appreciation of beauty in art are only achieved through a certain training, in which the particular kinds of proportion and balance essential to beauty are systematically studied. And the harmonies of Nature in colour and line will bear analysis as well as admiration. Again, the moral consciousness of mankind certainly claims to apprehend a real kind of order determining human action; and this order is one which, if the moral consciousness discerns truth at all, is assuredly not created by man nor purely a means to the realization of other kinds of goodness. The order of value does not conflict with that discerned by science; but it is of a different kind. The notes of a melody fully exhibit the laws of sound.

But they would exhibit them as fully if played backwards, in which case the melody itself would be destroyed.

We are, then, justified in speaking of an æsthetic and of a moral reason, both of which are in their essential nature theoretical or directed towards the true apprehension of reality, and not purely practical or concerned with devising means to ends. Much confusion is caused by supposing that the appreciative reason is necessarily practical and not theoretical, because it is directed towards the apprehension of values and not simply of facts. This false assumption has been particularly common in regard to the moral reason, and has been a potent factor in forming the opinion, as widespread as it is misleading, that the mind can only be set on an unprejudiced enquiry for truth when it ignores considerations of value or goodness altogether. Against this doctrine the idealistic tradition in philosophy has steadfastly supported the claim of the appreciative reason to give us theoretical insight into the nature of the real. And it seems to be true at least that our apprehensions of goodness and beauty make us aware of real orders different in kind from that order of existence which the sciences investigate as the realm of spatio-temporal fact. Into the order of spatio-temporal existence every event which happens, be it the falling of a stone, a delusion of insanity, or an inspiration of genius, must enter and find a place, and the ultimate aim of science is to exhibit all events as cohering with one another under the laws of that order. But the orders of value are ideal orders. They seem to reject some facts altogether, and never to be completely expressed in any, and yet to be no arbitrary figments of man's mind, but to impose themselves upon it with as objective an authority as the most stubborn fact conceivable. True, their authority binds men to take action, not simply in order to apprehend them more clearly, but in order to bring facts more closely into conformity with them. But this does not alter the truth that they are apprehended in knowledge, nor does the knowledge of them become practical, in the sense that it is concerned merely with devising means to ends. The contemplative knowledge of, and insight into, the order of goodness and beauty is quite distinct from the practical devising of means to make the world better and more beautiful than it is. The contemplative or theoretical knowledge is the condition of the practical activity.

If, then, we ask in what sense the whole world or the world as a whole is rational, and in what sense any true apprehension of reality can claim to be beyond reason, it is evident that our answer can only be given when we have first decided what kind of reason we are speaking of.

If we are speaking of demonstrative or mathematical reason, to call the universe rational means that all events are determined from beginning to end with an absolute rigidity which makes any alternative strictly inconceivable, and implies that the whole history of the world can in principle be deduced from the start with the same certainty as that with which mathematical conclusions may be deduced from given axioms or postulates. There would then be no such thing as real novelty or real time in the Bergsonian sense of the term. Human activity and freedom would likewise be sheer illusion, for nothing that anyone can do makes the smallest difference to the working out of the fixed scheme or formula of which all reality is the explication. Certainly, according to any Christian interpretation, the whole universe is not rational in this sense. And universal rationality of this kind is equally denied by scientific evolutionists of the schools of Bergson, Lloyd Morgan, and Alexander, however much they may differ from one another on other points. Indeed, but few modern philosophers of importance are rationalists in this mathematical sense of the word.

If we are speaking of the scientific reason, to call the universe rational means that it is true now, and always will be true, that all events which have occurred can be exhibited as following a certain coherent plan or pattern, which is dependent on the nature of spatio-temporal reality, and is expressible in terms of scientific laws or generalizations. Rationality of this kind does not imply that the future is wholly predictable or deducible from a complete knowledge of the past, or that no genuine novelty at any point arises, or that it is in principle strictly inconceivable that events should ever have taken a different course from that which in fact they took. It merely demands that everything which does in fact happen must happen as part of a pattern, so that if the conditions of its happening were reproduced it would certainly happen again without the interference of any external agency. The scientific reason does not claim that the emergence of life on this planet could have been predicted by any mind which knew the constitution of the planet before life emerged, nor that it is inconceivable that life should never have emerged at all. What it does claim is that it is in principle possible that the conditions under which life emerged might be reproduced, and that if they were reproduced life would in fact emerge again.

Now whether or not Christianity can accept the claim that the world we live in is wholly rational in this sense is a difficult and complex question which need not here detain us. Let us for the sake of the argument accept it. It is still evident that

a world which was wholly rational either in the scientific or in the mathematical sense might be exceedingly irrational from another point of view.

In a universe mathematically rational throughout there can be no moral order at all. Our very experience of moral freedom and activity is a sheer and inevitable delusion. The scientific reason is not so drastic in negation. But from its point of view, the rationality of the universe would not be affected if we suppose that man's moral and æsthetic ideals are his ideals and nothing more, if they find no ultimate response or justification in the nature of the universe as a whole. If we suppose that man is destined to vanish as he came upon the scene of cosmic evolution, that all his strivings after goodness and beauty mean nothing and effect nothing in the ultimate scheme of things, beyond manifesting in themselves the pattern of that part of the spatio-temporal order which they themselves constitute, then the rationality of the universe as postulated by science remains secure as ever, but all the same we can hardly be deaf to the protests of another reason which remains profoundly unsatisfied. A universe which produces the noblest ideals of man's spiritual nature merely to smudge them out again, with his crimes and follies, in an impartial dissolution, certainly cannot be called rational in every sense. There is an appreciative reason. And if in its view the universe is rational, neither the mathematical nor the scientific reason can furnish a complete account of reality. The moral and æsthetic consciousness also claims to apprehend a real and authoritative order in the world, and in itself constitutes a form of reason which, since it determines the very nature of justice, cannot be justly excluded as an arbiter of what is rational.

Now if we are to speak of the whole universe as rational in an absolute sense, what is the reason which is to arbitrate? What is the ultimate criterion of rationality? Clearly that reason is ultimate which can succeed in fitting all reality into a coherent order and harmony, and our ultimate judgment of what is orderly and harmonious must be given by the whole human mind at its best and fullest when it is directed to know the truth. The demonstrative or mathematical reason fails to find a principle of universal harmony, because the moral and, to a less degree, the æsthetic consciousness inevitably rebel against it when it claims to include all reality under that type of order which satisfies it. Similarly the scientific reason fails. For the principle of its order is equally fulfilled whatever value-judgment is to be passed on the cosmic process as a whole. Its very inclusiveness is its undoing. For by including good and evil events indifferently, it excludes from satisfaction that other

type of reason which requires the bringing of all reality under the principle of an order which can definitely be called good. Can the appreciative reason, therefore, alone claim to exhibit the rationality of the universe as a whole? It can only succeed in vindicating its claim, if it can show how the mixed good and evil of the world as we now know it can ultimately altogether subserve and fulfil a plan or purpose of goodness.

Yet in this attempt the appreciative reason must necessarily come to include more than the discerning of a strictly or simply moral and æsthetic order in the world of reality. It must assign a due place to the rigorous discipline of mathematical reasoning and to those patient enquiries of science into nature, the very value of which consists in an entire refusal to colour what is with what ought to be. The final or all-inclusive order of goodness must incorporate principles of order which, considered strictly in themselves, reject moral and æsthetic valuation, and are discerned only by a mind which has deliberately suspended its powers of moral and æsthetic valuation in order to discover what is. Moreover, the facts which the appreciative reason judges to be evil must somehow be brought within the good rationality of the whole.

For that reason and rationality, therefore, which can put in a really justifiable claim to be all-inclusive, it is better to use a special term. We will call them *metaphysical*. The claim of the metaphysical reason is to find room within itself for the departmental work of those special forms of reason which we have termed mathematical, scientific, and appreciative, and to exhibit the several orders of logical necessity, natural law, beauty, and moral goodness, as being finally harmonized within a whole order which it judges to be good. If the universe as a whole is rational, the claim of the metaphysical reason to give ultimate truth must be not merely abstractly justifiable, but actually valid. But is the universe as a whole rational? The metaphysical reason certainly cannot demonstrate that it is. It cannot exhibit in satisfactory perfection the all-inclusive order of goodness which it strives to apprehend. It can but guess and indicate possibilities. It remains conceivable that it may be wrong. In other words, at this level, as the best metaphysicians have always implicitly acknowledged, the common antithesis between faith and reason simply cannot be maintained. An act of faith alone can give assurance that the universe is rational. And ultimately the metaphysical rationalist is obliged to urge his faith in reason as a reason for his faith.

What, then, of reason and religion? Once we have abandoned the old-fashioned idea that the activity of reason consists only in

demonstrative proof, and find it rather to consist in the progressive apprehension of a universal order, it is evident that the whole situation is changed. Rationalism, as we have seen, can no longer afford to dispense with faith. And theism, on its side, is no less concerned than rationalism to maintain the sovereignty of universal order. No doubt many types of metaphysic which claim to base themselves on reason may interpret the universal order in a non-theistic way. But the theist's best reply is to show that his belief really exhibits a fuller and more inclusive harmony. This is the line of apologetic which we termed rational in the previous article.

What, then, of religious experience? If religious truth is to be commended as a general method of ordering reality, what is the place and meaning of the specifically religious fact and experience which the empiricist so often declares to be beyond the grasp of reason? If he seriously means that the religious fact and experience are to be placed above the criticism of that reason of the whole man which we have called metaphysical, then he must stand condemned by rationalism and theism alike. If the order of the universe is fundamentally one, all departments of human experience must be inter-related, and it is only by their mutual criticism that the order of the whole can be brought to light. It is no doubt a sore temptation, in view of the successful iconoclasm of so much modern philosophy and science, to try to put the ark of the covenant out of reach. This attempt has been made in different ways by those who claim that Christian dogma is to be accepted on divine authority without further question, by the Ritschlians who alleged that the truth of Christianity consisted in value judgments with which metaphysical philosophy had no concern, and by some moderns who rest belief simply on the unique character of the religious experience itself. But all such efforts are foredoomed to failure. To the candid observer they do but make religious faith play the part of the legendary Canute before the advancing tide. And they are a chief cause for the conviction held by many philosophers that religion can furnish no strictly theoretic or ultimate truth at all.

But if the metaphysical reason has frankly abandoned the claim to present all truth in terms of demonstrative logic, there is no need for the religious empiricist to bar its entry into his domain. Rather he may urge upon its consideration the argument that the religious fact and the religious experience are unique and inexplicable and manifestly God-given precisely in this, that they shed such wonderful illumination upon the whole plan of reality. If, he may contend, belief in God is merely to be commended as a means of co-ordinating and ration-

alizing our experiences other than religious, it can never succeed even in that task. Religious truth can never exhibit the rational order of the universe, if it remains a general theory and no more. But here in religious facts and religious experiences, sifted and criticized by the whole activity of the human mind, we discover something of unique worth—namely, a particular concrete fact and reality of experience, which illuminates all others and reveals their meaning. The claim of certain facts and certain experiences to give us God, or to be the direct result of divine action, is justified precisely by this evidence, that through them as through no others we discern the ultimate order and significance of all. Their mysterious inexplicability is after all but the reverse side of their explanatoriness. There is no mystery in what is merely dark. There is nothing awful in what is meaningless. In the mental as in the physical sphere, it is intensity of light which at once bewilders and clarifies the vision. And if we say of any truth, "Not flesh and blood, but God revealed it," our justification must be that it explains too much to be itself explained. "Credo quia absurdum," we may still say of it if we like. But the absurdity lies in this, that such a universal range and depth of meaning could have been concentrated at a particular time and place. If the truth were not really true, the absurdity would vanish also.

In the modern world, therefore, the consequences of maintaining the traditional distinction between the truths of natural theology which are proved by reason, and the truths of revealed or Christian theology which are beyond reason, appear to us to be incalculably harmful. If by reason we mean demonstrative logic, it is clear that neither Christianity nor theism, nor any metaphysical system, can be proved thereby. But if we are speaking of the metaphysical reason, to place any truth beyond its criticism is really treason to faith itself. No doubt we may still justifiably say that the truth of Christianity is beyond even the metaphysical reason, in the sense that the human mind could never have reached a Christian faith in God if the Incarnation had not in fact taken place. And this probably is all that orthodoxy really intends. Nevertheless the traditional theology which distinguishes sharply between the apologetic for theism and the apologetic for Christianity has disastrous results in practice. It encourages the idea that Christianity is, in James's phrase, a mere over-belief to theism, and that the rational order of the world stands secure, whether Christianity be accepted or not. Thus Christianity is inevitably placed on the defensive against reason, whereas in modern apologetics its best weapon is attack. The real question is not whether Christian faith can be defended against the assaults of reason, but whether

apart from Christian faith the world can be viewed as rational at all. And many modernizers who put the religious or the Christian experience in the place which tradition assigns to Christian dogma are only repeating and aggravating the traditional mistake. Neither dogma nor particular experience of religion has any authority of truth apart from its power to illuminate the world of experience as a rational whole. And if it would show its power, it must not remain in the cloister, but come forth into the market-place of thought. The Parable of the Talents should remind us that not even the faith itself can be kept whole and undefiled by being kept out of circulation.

CANONIZATION IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

PRAYER-BOOK Revision has had one consequence hitherto little noticed. It has recovered for the Church of England both the opportunity and the power of Canonization. It is to be hoped we shall use it. We badly need as a Church to strengthen all in the Prayer Book which may contribute to a deeper sense of the Communion of Saints. Our people have little knowledge of the history either of their own communion or of the Church of the ages; their belittling of institutional religion is due partly to ignorance of their own kingdom. The Calendar touches real and full religion at these points, and many others, subtly and surely; without a revision of the Calendar, no revision can be complete or good.

The realization of the importance of the Calendar came suddenly to the Convocations and the Assembly. It has not yet come to the man in the street, who regarded the calendrical discussions with contempt. The Revisers could feel no doubt about the exclusion of some and the inclusion of other names. But the making of saints is an exciting pursuit, which few can resist on the rare occasions when it is possible. The Assemblies, at least, found it so. Therefore, after a strange and various list of names had been suggested, the House of Clergy settled the matter for the time being by the Resolutions which appear in "C. A. 158":

1. That the Archbishops be requested to appoint a Commission representing the Provinces of Canterbury and York, to make a historical investigation of the question of adding names to the

Calendar, the grounds for their selection, and the methods and procedure for their inclusion in the Calendar, and to report with recommendations for the English Church.

2. That an authority be appointed which shall judicially investigate and report upon the claims of each name proposed for addition to the Calendar.

3. That it is desirable that the Calendar contain only names for which some liturgical observance is provided.

4. That the Calendar may be followed, if it is thought desirable, by a list of saints and worthies, drawn up in calendrical form, but not intended for liturgical observance.

5. That provision for the liturgical commemoration of local saints, not already included in the Prayer Book Calendar, and to whom churches have been dedicated, may be made for local or diocesan use, under the direction of the Ordinary.

The wisdom and important bearing of these resolutions will appear after a brief survey of the practice of the Catholic Church in other ages and in our sister communions today.

II.

Calendar and canonization have been linked together from the earliest days of the Church. They trace back, gloriously, to early martyrs. The relics of martyrs were regarded with reverence and surrounded with prayer and praise; their tombs became altars. This was a natural observance of a devout and persecuted people; yet no public veneration was permitted except by the authority of the local Bishop. Such reverence slowly and rightly extended to other heroes of the Faith than martyrs: the confessor, the pastor, the theologian, of notable holiness; later still, to the saints of the New Testament. Registers of those thus approved for veneration were carefully kept, and their names recited at the Eucharist: such a commemoration of old Roman saints remains fixed in the Roman Mass today. From these registers or diptychs sprang the Calendars. Each diocese had its own, however strongly influenced by its metropolitan see it might be.

The right to authorize veneration, to add a name to the diptychs, pertained to the local Bishop. It has continued in the Eastern Church to belong to the Episcopate, whether acting locally or provincially. Modifications or developments of differing importance have arisen in the different churches of the East; but even where development has gone furthest, as in Russia, the rights of the local Bishop have not disappeared.

The Russian Church has developed far in the direction of more exact definition; and it is interesting to compare its path with those of Rome and of Canterbury. It recognizes three distinct grades or groups among the servants of God whose cult is permitted:*

1. Those venerated by order of the supreme ecclesiastical authority throughout the whole Russian Church.

2. Those whose cult is approved for a particular part of the Church, a diocese, a monastery, a parish, etc.

3. Those venerated by popular feeling with tacit consent of ecclesiastical authority, though not yet canonized—i.e., on the anniversary of their deaths special services are said in which their intercession is invoked.

The right of canonization is exercised by local Bishops subject to the sanction of the Metropolitan; but from the time of Peter the Great the "Group I" canonizations can be issued only by the Holy Synod. On such occasions the process begins by the submission of the case to the Synod by a Bishop (or, rarely, by the civil authority). The Synod appoints a Commission of investigation which takes evidence; and then, generally but not always, waits some two years and begins again. "A further commission then reports to the Holy Synod, which issues a statement, submitted (before the war) to the Imperial authority for sanction, which places the person on the list of saints, and orders an exposition of his relics, the composition of an Office, the creation of a festival. . . ." The subsequent ceremony includes the final recitation of prayers for the repose of the saint's soul; after which they are never more said; his intercession is invoked instead.

Certain points of the Russian tradition of canonization may be emphasized.

First, notice that in the Russian, a national Church, the State, in the person of the Czar, has hitherto co-operated with the Church. The parallel to the only original Anglican effort of the kind, the insertion of the name of Charles I. King and Martyr, is close.

Secondly, the Russian test of sanctity, other than holiness of life or martyrdom, agrees with the Roman in requiring the evidence of miracle. Another demand, of incorruptibility of body, was deemed non-essential at the canonization of St. Seraphim of Sarov in 1903.

Thirdly, mark the development of "grading." At first sight, it seems singular to grade the saints of God. But this is

* Cf. the Dean of Winchester's article, "Canonization," in Hastings' *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*.

not an order of merit, but a necessity for commemoration. One saint shows Christ to a village, another to a nation, another to the world. Their holiness may be equal, their commemoration cannot be. Some local saints are found by time to have a wider appeal; time may lessen the inspiration of another who dominated his generation. That this Russian grouping is not artificial is proved by the fact that Rome also has developed a threefold grading, and that the Anglican Resolutions quoted above have independently reached the same position in their distinction between names in the Calendar (Res. 1-3), saints commemorated locally (Res. 5), and "a list of saints and worthies" (Res. 4).

It should be added that the Russian Church has shown care and reserve over adding names to the first group. "Universal veneration" is decreed to few. Between 1547 and 1721 only fifteen saints were thus canonized, and since 1721 only six. This does not suggest that the more intense centralization and the more elaborate process of Rome secure the standard of sanctity better than the simpler systems of the East.

III.

The process of Canonization in the Roman Church is well enough known. There is some doubt as to the exact date when in the West the local Bishop lost his rights to the Pope. The Bull *De reliquiis et veneratione sanctorum* of Pope Alexander IV. definitely reserved cases of beatification to the Roman See. But for a century, at least, the Popes had been claiming this power, and the Bishops' right had been growing more restricted.

Yet the protracted and elaborate system of modern Rome took long to develop. The inquiry into the saint's claim was in the Middle Ages often swift and summary. St. Thomas of Canterbury died in 1170, and was canonized in 1173. St. Francis died in 1226, and was canonized in 1228. St. Antony of Padua was canonized in 1232, the year after his death. Nor as yet had the difference between beatification and canonization declared itself.

The decrees of Urban VIII. 1625 and 1634 defined the present procedure. There are three main stages, each involving an investigation, and each raising the claimant name, if it be successful, to a higher grade. Thus Rome also recognizes a threefold distinction. The first decisive step is the Introduction of the Case—no easy thing, for it involves an examination of the pertinent documents so strict that if the Pope, on the advice of the examining Cardinals, pronounce his approval of the process, the servant of God *ipso facto* mounts the ladder, and

receives the title of Venerable. But this does not entitle him or her to any manifestation of cultus.

The essential part of the procedure can now be begun; and there follows the long and singular process of Beatification. In the words of Fr. Delehaye, it takes the form of a "suit at law, pleaded before the tribunal of the Congregation of Rites, which is a permanent commission of Cardinals, assisted by a certain number of subordinate officials, and presided over by a Cardinal. The supreme Judge is the Pope himself. The *Postulator*, who is the mandatory of a diocese or ecclesiastical commonalty, is the solicitor. He must furnish the proofs which are collected according to very stringent rules. The *Promoter of the Faith*, commonly called the Devil's Advocate, is the defendant, whose official duty it is to point out to the tribunal the weak points of the case."

The proofs to be established for the success of the candidate are three: a reputation for sanctity, the heroic quality of the virtues, and the working of miracles. Clear evidence of supernatural grace, that is to say, must be added to goodness or learning however eminent and influential. "Beatification" follows. It permits a limited cultus; veneration is not required nor authorized throughout the whole Church; it is permitted to a particular diocese or country or religious order.

"Canonization" does away with the limitation; what has hitherto been a permission becomes a precept of the Church; a local and restricted veneration becomes universal; it is "the solemn and definitive act by which the Pope decrees the plenitude of public honours." The process, rather expensive than long, consists principally in the discussion of miracles (usually two in number) obtained by the intercession of the Blessed since the decree of beatification, and is followed by noble ceremonies of promulgation.

In addition to this, the ordinary method of formal canonization, the Pope, in certain cases, can omit the judicial process and the ceremonies, and order some servant of God to be venerated in the universal Church. This rarer method is known as "equivalent canonization," and is applied only in cases where a saint has been from a remote period the object of veneration, is certainly historical, and his intercession miraculous. Queen Margaret of Scotland was canonized thus.

Into such an elaborate procedure has the simple act of placing the name of a martyr or confessor on the diptychs grown. It has strong points. Immense care is taken over the examination of sanctity, even though it may be that the emphasis on miracle, beyond the miracle of holiness itself, does not appeal to modern minds. But miracle is widely enough interpreted

when it includes all striking answers to prayer. Then the immense weight with which, through this long course with its formalities, fees, suits and solemnities, the new saint is commended to the devotion of the faithful is all to the good. For the main purpose of canonization* is to conserve the heroic example of the servant of God, and the inspiration which his life of prayer, love and good works has brought to many. Thus the standards of holiness are kept ever before the mind of the Church's members, and the glory of its fellowship increased.

IV.

The bearing of the five Resolutions of the House of Clergy will now be clear. The right of the Anglican Episcopate to place a name in its Calendar is unquestionable by Catholic tradition. An insertion by the whole Episcopate (if the name be not already one that is canonized) is itself a canonization, a precept or commendation rather than a mere permission, equivalent to the "first grade" of the Russian Church. Any further requirements of the modern constitution of the English Church, the consent, in differing degrees of authority, of Convocation, of the Church Assembly, even of Parliament, only strengthen the commendation to the faithful of any new name added. But Catholic tradition now requires more. It demands *careful investigation*. This presumably is to be provided by the new Commission or by the authority to be appointed, "which shall judicially investigate and report upon the claims of each name proposed." It demands *liturgical observance*. This is already provided, by Common or otherwise, in the Deposited Book, if it come into force. It suggests, if the differing yet consentient practice of East and West has weight, over and beyond observance of the foremost saints throughout the whole Church, provision for *the observance locally* of saints of local interest; and a less official, non-liturgical remembrance of great Christians whose claims to veneration by all are not, for one reason or another, generally acknowledged. For all these demands of Catholic tradition the Resolutions provide; and if they are carried into effect, not only will the authority of the Calendar be increased, but the inspiration and veneration of the Christian heroes, the sense of the Communion of Saints, and even the knowledge of Church history, will grow throughout our Communion. All this we need badly.

* It is unnecessary to discuss here the theological question of the Invocation of Saints, which in the Catholic churches of both East and West is allowed after canonization; or yet the various subtle questions of papal infallibility in Beatification and Canonization.

V.

It is indeed high time that the principles which govern the names in our Calendar were set in order. More than any part of the Prayer Book, it bears the marks of Reformation haste and experiment.

To explain the situation exactly, it may help to summarize, well-known though they be, the steps which led to the list in our present dying book.

Notice, first, that a principle of differentiation is there already. The names are divided into "Red Letter" days, and "Black Letter." For the former full liturgical observance is prescribed; concerning the observance of the latter, little or nothing has been said until the present Revision. The reason for the distinction was simple: Red Letter names and events are scriptural; Black Letter not necessarily so. Most Christian saints must be post-scriptural!

But, next, how were these names selected?

Cranmer tackled the revision of the Calendar with his wonted zeal. Two draft Calendars are extant, which illustrate the movement of his thoughts. The earliest contains the names of Biblical saints—the present ones plus SS. Mary Magdalene, Timothy, Titus, and all four great festivals of B.V.M.; also of twelve chief Doctors of the Church, and twelve other saints from the Sarum Calendar. He adds a few names chosen for no reason that can be thought of—*i.e.*, the patriarch Benjamin, SS. Phileas and Philomorus, S. Babilus, S. Dorotheus, etc.

The first draft, except for these last insertions, was comprehensible; not so the second. It was wild to the last degree. For instance, the vacant days in January were filled up with Old Testament names in chronological order, Abel, Noe, Abraham, etc. When these fail New Testament names continue the list. It is Scripturalism run mad.

"The draft Calendars abound in faults and follies," remarks staid "Procter and Frere"; and the First Prayer Book returned to a policy of exclusiveness. It contained nothing but twenty-five "Red Letter" days, with full liturgical provision. Twenty-four of these held their place through all future changes; but St. Mary Magdalene reappeared in 1552 only in Black Letters.

The one gain of the 1552 book, indeed, was the invention of Black Letter festivals—four only, St. George, Lammes, St. Lawrence and St. Clement, besides St. Mary Magdalene—which should be kept as commemorations without any change of service. The Elizabethan Calendar of 1561 took advantage of the new invention and increased the list with fifty-seven names

and feasts. In 1604 is added St. Enurchus, who doesn't exist, though St. Evurtius does—and why he should be drawn from oblivion is not sufficiently clear. In 1661 came the excellent additions of St. Alban (on the wrong date) and the Venerable Bede. And also King Charles.

Now, while the principles behind the selection of Red Letter days are clear enough, those behind the Black Letter are not. The list is confused and illogical, and much of it meaningless to the living Church. Respect, we can see, has been paid to the old Sarum Calendar; all its double feasts are in the Prayer Book, under one or other category, except the Assumption and the two festivals of St. Thomas of Canterbury. The additions of 1661 show a sensible purpose of representing local English saints, but the principle is not carried very far. The Bishops in 1661, defending the lesser Saints' Days from the Puritan attack, gave a double motive for their presence, "they are left in the Calendar not that they should be so (as the Red Letters) kept as holy days, but they are useful for the preservation of their memories, and for other reasons, as for leases, law days, etc." It was ingenuous of the Bishops to plead the secular motive; but as Procter points out, their addition of SS. Alban and Bede shows "which of their two reasons they considered most important."

VI.

In any Revision of the existing Prayer Book, therefore, the commemoration of saints was bound to be strictly examined. For by this time the only real justification for the appearance of a name in the Calendar is for edification and observance. With the growth of sacramental celebration, the opportunity for observance has become both great and desirable. An arbitrary list of names has become impossible. Nobody desires to celebrate SS. Evurtius or Machutus; almost everybody SS. Francis, Aidan, Athanasius.

The whole question was reviewed in a brilliant and cogent chapter in *Some Principles of Liturgical Reform*, by Bishop Frere. It appeared in 1911, and established the principles both of inclusion and exclusion. A new Calendar appeared in the Report of the Revision Committee, 1922, and remains with little change in the Deposited Book. The principles of exclusion are simple: (1) lack of historicity, and (2) lack of special interest or sufficiently serious claim for liturgical commemoration throughout the Church. These vanish: SS. Lucian, Prisca, Agatha, Blasius, Valentine, Edward, King of the West Saxons (twice), Invention of the Cross, St. Nicomede, Translation of St. Martin (St. Martin's day rightly remains), SS. Evurtius, Lambert,

Denys, Brice, Machutus, Catherine, Silvester, King Charles. Though some may feel sore over one or other* of these disappearances, it is a conservative expulsion; neither principle has been rigidly pressed. To take one instance from each category, St. Anne and St. Vincent of Spain remain.

Again the principles on which the insertions are based are obvious enough. St. Mary Magdalene and the Transfiguration become Red Letter days. The Commemoration of All Souls stands by itself. Otherwise the insertions rest upon three principles.

1. *The saints of universal interest.* Of the great names of the individual Church are added; SS. Antony of Egypt, Polycarp, Chrysostom, Leo the Great, Athanasius, Monica, Basil, Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, and Ignatius of Antioch. Hermit, martyr, doctor, prelate, monk, and matron are thus all represented. The entries of the medieval saints are gloriously strengthened by the names of SS. Catherine of Siena, Bernard, and Francis. But why did the Bishops exclude St. Thomas Aquinas?

2. *The saints of local interest* make a long and various list: SS. Wulfstan, Patrick, Cuthbert, Anselm, Aldhelm, Columba, Oswald, Aidan, Ninian, Theodore of Tarsus, Hilda, King Alfred, and "Saints, Martyrs, and Doctors of the Church of England."

3. A third principle, to include in the Anglican Calendar at least one great saint of each great country, accounts for the name of Anskar of Sweden. It is a neighbourly and Catholic intent, but is it sound? Anskar will never mean much to anybody except the small and specialized group who work for closer relations with the Church of Sweden. But the principle has worked further than this one entry; for it has saved others of no great interest from exclusion—e.g., St. Vincent, Spanish Deacon and Martyr, of whom we know next to nothing (how much better would not St. Theresa, for instance, represent Spain!), St. Remigius (surely France is sufficiently represented by SS. Hilary of Poitiers, Martin, and Bernard), St. Fabian of Rome, who is scarcely wanted while we have both St. Lawrence and St. Agnes.

4. A fourth principle, the number of Church dedications to certain saints, has saved the names of SS. Nicholas and Margaret, and perhaps of SS. Leonard and Giles from exclusion. If a good case can be made for the traditional patrons of children, prisoners, and cripples, it does not seem necessary to keep the legendary St. Margaret in the Calendar itself, now that diocesan provision can be made where it is wanted.

But, when all is said, the new Calendar is an immense

* Especially over King Charles, who died for the Church.

improvement upon the old. No criticism of real importance can be made on what it has done. The dissatisfaction with it in the National Church Assembly derived from what it had left undone.

Not a single saint of later date than A.D. 1380 found a place. This single fact destroys at a blow the devotional reality of the Calendar and much of its value for purposes of history, edification, and inspiration. The Church will not give us a saint to celebrate over six centuries which have been as full of saints as any others. Nay, more, these centuries are exactly those in which we can best understand and realize the conditions of such lives. The veneration of the modern man is officially confined to the great Christians of ancient and medieval times. The modern martyr, the modern man of prayer and heroic deed, are omitted from the lists of those whom the Provinces of Canterbury and York delight to honour.

The difficulty is partly that since the Reformation divided the Christian West, great Christians tend to be looked at from a controversial or denominational angle, and few of them indeed have escaped the prejudices which arise from the warring relations of different communions or parties. The obstacles which a modern candidate has to meet, the tests he or she must pass before inclusion, are different from those of ancient or medieval days; and the special principles which are to govern such selection have yet to be thought out. Obvious questions rise up. Is it proper for an Anglican Calendar to include a post-Reformation Roman saint? Or an indisputably Protestant one? Have we Anglican names which reach the agelong Catholic standards? May a candidate be allowed the benefit if he make even one grave mistake in the days of his conversion?

VII.

To these questions no definite answer can be given. It depends on the character and works of the individual suggested. Yet it is possible to find some principles which would allow a beginning to be made.

A first principle might well be, to seek to include the names of such servants of God whose influence endures and works powerfully in the life of today.

A second, that names, for the present, be limited to those around whose names no real or bitter controversy now centres.

And here, it seems to the writer, three names stand out, which would, in addition, add the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries to our Calendar.

The fifteenth-century name is that of Thomas à Kempis. The writer* of the most influential Christian book outside the New Testament has as yet been given no ecclesiastical honours. Towards the end of the seventeenth century Maximilian Hendrik, Prince Bishop of Cologne, began to collect the necessary documents for the cause of his beatification. His death stopped this, and though a great monument was erected over his relics in St. Michael's Church, Zwolle, in 1897, by subscriptions from all over the world, St. Thomas, as his works have proved him, has received no official honour from the Church. The miracle of his help and guidance to tens of thousands in *Ecclesia Anglicana* is enough for us; we should all love to celebrate him, and all would know him whom they celebrated. And the very quietness of his life is valuable teaching in these rushing days.

Next, Sir Thomas More. He too belongs to pre-Reformation days. No controversy attaches to his death now. Every Englishman knows the noble story of it. Rome has beatified him, and intends very soon to canonize. Surely we can go hand in hand with her here, with unmixed joy. And this St. Thomas was a *layman*. It were a most valuable addition to our Calendar to include one who was great, and greatly Christian, as a statesman, a lawyer, a father, and a writer.

Similarly, we could add the seventeenth-century name of Lancelot Andrewes, whose tomb is by the altar of Southwark Cathedral. His *Preces Privatae* prove the saint and reveal the man—far and away the greatest manual of prayer ever written. It makes one who was a great doctor, a great Bishop, and a great confessor in a difficult age, live still, and fashion English souls in prayer. Besides, he was a chief translator of our Bible.

Here is the place to urge—as Dr. Frere has urged—the inclusion on October 15 of St. Theresa, “a spiritual writer whose fame and influence transcend the limits of time or country or particular confession. The mention of her name raises no controversial questions, but only recalls a life of intense vigour, piety, and spiritual power, together with teaching on prayer and spiritual life which is unexampled both in its psychological insight and its religious penetration.”

Further suggestions lead us into the less sure regions of personal sympathy. Yet there are two on which it might seem there might be general agreement. One is Nicholas Ferrar of Little Gidding, a name “representative of piety, not exactly lay nor exactly monastic, but conspicuous and fragrant as well as original.” The other, Henry Martyn, the pioneer of the

* The question of authorship would doubtless be examined by the investigating commission.

vast missionary work of the Church in the nineteenth century, an Evangelical whom all would delight to honour, whose motto (which he fulfilled to the letter) was, "Let me burn out for God," and whose body lies beside that of St. Basil the Great and St. John Chrysostom in the wilds of his Asia.

VIII.

The labours of Henry Martyn remind us that English Christianity has not often produced servants of God of the great heroic order, say, of St. Francis or St. Francis Xavier. Yet there have been two moderns of this rank, and if we seek reality in our Calendar it becomes a serious question as to how they are to be treated. Must John Wesley and David Livingstone be relegated to the "list of saints and worthies"? John Wesley made grave mistakes, much of his work went into separation, yet there was more Churchmanship in him and his brother than in the whole Church of his day; he drove Calvinism out of English popular religion for ever; and both directly and indirectly he renewed the life of the Church and the Christian consciousness of his race. Of his heroic tirelessness we need only say, it is unsurpassed in the long history of Christianity. His brother Charles, no less heroic, shows a deeper consistency, and his influence, through his 6,000 hymns, has not been less permanent. Yet it would be impossible to canonize Charles and not John. And there is a third, as great as either in her proper sphere, their mother. Susanna Wesley can be compared to St. Monica without any sense of unfitness. May not a way out be found here, and the three names be grouped happily together on the death day of Susanna on July 23 (1742)—the English mother, the tireless evangelist, the sweet singer of the English Church?

David Livingstone, though the real founder of the U.M.C.A. (and many other Missions), was not even a member of the Church of England; as events worked out, he cannot be said to have owed allegiance to any denomination. Yet to no man in history has it been given to redeem a continent to a like extent. He is the peer of St. Francis Xavier, and his work in its measure more final. To read his life is to win the inspiration that only a few even of the greatest Christian saints can give; and it touches English imagination at the points where it is most ready to admire, and where, in view of our responsibilities to other races all over the globe, admiration is most fruitful. For the heroism of Livingstone was purely Christian both in its motive and in its conduct; and it is a sin for the Church not to make every use of one of the noblest sermons ever preached by a life.

It is too early as yet, even with the centenaries of John Keble gathering about us, to propose the names of the Oxford Movement. They must wait, with many others, until the fires of controversy have died down, and the beauty of their work is seen in peace. And yet one step of a different kind might suitably be taken with the goodwill of all: can we not build some of our new churches as memorials to John Keble? It were a more vivid and useful dedication than many of the old-time saints. And it would witness to that enduring reverence which will undoubtedly one day place his name in the Calendar.

IX.

This paper, then, has sought to show that the Resolutions of the House of Clergy have recovered for the Church—if they be put into force—all its traditional powers of “canonization,” and set them upon a sound basis. For the revised Calendar of the Deposited Book we can already be grateful. But life and inspiration will never enter it as they should until some names are included of a later date than 1380. For the ministry of the Calendar is powerful and should be fully used. It can help us just where we are weak. As right selection makes it real and vivid, it will exalt the Englishman’s sense of the Communion of Saints, and increase his enthusiasm for the men of Christ, his piety towards the Church that bore them, his faith in the Lord they served, and his purpose to go and do likewise.

E. MILNER-WHITE.

THE SEALED BOOKS

THE tiny Suffolk parish of Ampton possesses what the late Dean Goulburn spoke of as “a great and somewhat rare treasure,” one of the Sealed Books. This led me to investigate the subject of these books, of which I formerly knew practically nothing. I made enquiries in many directions, and especially I wrote to every English Cathedral and Collegiate Church. I met with great courtesy, and obtained much useful information. But only one letter told me anything about the copies which were missing, and that, curiously enough, came from New Zealand. From that letter I ascertained the whereabouts of two. But so many of the letters betrayed the utter ignorance of the writers with regard to the Sealed Books. The common opinion seemed to be that every folio Prayer-Book of Charles II.

was a Sealed Book. One of my correspondents, who really ought to have known better, a theological and liturgical writer of considerable repute, offered to sell me his copy for £3! A Dean, in the strong-room of whose Cathedral is a well-preserved Sealed Book, apparently thought of it as a Sealed *Bible*! Whilst a Bishop's widow of light and leading, in reply to my question about a copy which her late husband was (wrongly) supposed to have possessed, spoke of it as "a Book of Seals"! A famous Dean does "not think we have it at —," but there it was, right enough, and the Archdeacon told me all about it. So, before going further, it will be safer to explain what is meant by a "Sealed Book." In 1661 the Prayer-Book was revised, and the alterations and additions were entered by Sancroft the secretary in a printed folio of 1636, which is known as the "CONVOCATION BOOK." A clear copy of this, written on paper, was attached to the Caroline Act of Uniformity, and was hence called the "BOOK ANNEXED." That was signed by the four houses of Convocation, and became the legal standard Prayer-Book. Both these books are in the Library of the House of Lords. To make reference easier, a certain number of folio Prayer-Books, already printed, were to be altered by the pen by certain Commissioners appointed by the King, and so brought into exact agreement with the "Book Annexed." These are the "Sealed Books," intended to be used only as legal records. Five copies were to be "delivered" to the Law Courts and Tower. Each Cathedral and Collegiate Church was to "obtain" one at its own cost. Each copy was to be corrected and certified by the Commissioners, and then sealed with the Great Seal of England (hence its name), and Letters Patent were to be attached to it. The highest status was then given to these books as legal records. They were to "be accounted as good records as this book itself hereunto annexed." (Cf. Act of Uniformity). The alterations with the pen were to be made by Royal Commissioners. The Commission is printed in full on p. 100 of Vol. I. of Dr. A. J. Stephens's *Book of Common Prayer*, 1849-54. The Commissioners were all men of mark, both clerical and lay, and they were busy men. They numbered twenty-five in all, of whom four were Bishops, eight Deans, six Doctors of Divinity, four Doctors of Laws, and "three Clerkes." But of these apparently only nine acted. At any rate, on twenty-three certificates of which I have information, the names of only nine occur—four Deans, one Archdeacon, two D.D.'s, one LL.D., and one "Clerke." Of these, four signed over twenty times, one thirteen times, and the others each under ten times.

These men were likely to do their work carefully and

accurately. But their accuracy has been impugned. Dr. Stephens, a most careful writer, who devoted a good deal of attention to these books, wrote (*op. cit.*, I., p. clxxix.): "It seems that the engrossed book (*i.e.*, 'Book Annexed') was not free from clerical errors, but the positive duty of the Commissioners was collation, not correction, and to make the printed book before them correspond as minutely as possible with the MS. attached to the Statute of Uniformity; and they have, seemingly, discharged their duty with the most scrupulous accuracy." Even in the "Convocation Book" itself there are some doubtful places. Correct or incorrect, the Sealed Books were not subject to question as legal records. The Act of Uniformity gave no appeal from them.

We now have to enquire how many Sealed Books there were. Blunt, in his *Prayer-Book* (I., xliij.), says that "as many copies were sealed as the Lord Chancellor thought fit," and he gives a reference to "State Papers, Domestic, Charles II., lvij., 42." But reference to the Public Records Office, where these papers are preserved, brings no helpful information. They do not know the number.

I think we may feel certain that there were no "spare copies," and no copies for the private use of any of the Commissioners. The status given by law to the Sealed Book, and the labour involved in correction by the busy and eminent Commissioners, seem to forbid that, as would also the cost. The Oxford Sealed Book cost the Dean and Chapter (including carriage from London) £9 2s. in the money of 1662, when £10 would buy at least three cows. Each Cathedral paid its own "proper costs and charges" in the matter.

But how many books were there? There were the five legal copies. That every Cathedral had one I have no doubt. The fact of the Bishop's Court attached to each seems to make that certain. The Collegiate Churches (with Dean and Chapter) in 1662 were Westminster, Windsor, Manchester, Ripon, Southwell, Middleham, Heytesbury, Brecon, and Wolverhampton—nine in all. Here we are faced by two difficulties: first, that of supposing that any of these would dare to disregard the plain order of the Act; and then the greater difficulty of supposing that a book provided at such cost and dignified with the Great Seal would be lost completely in all these nine churches, and especially in such churches as Westminster and Windsor. But in no one of these churches now is there any trace or tradition of a Sealed Book. I shall therefore presume that they never had one.

So we come to the twenty-six Cathedrals, not including Man, to which the Act did not apply. In the case of Worcester,

Bath and Wells, Peterborough, Chester, Bristol, St. David's, Llandaff, and Bangor, the books have vanished. In the eighteen other Cathedrals they remain. So, with the legal copies, we can account for thirty-one copies of which eight have strayed. I believe, therefore, that the number of Sealed Books was thirty-one and no more.

In 1849 Dr. A. J. Stephens, in his first volume (*op. cit.*), printed in full the text and corrections (blue) of the Sealed Book of the Chancery. He had also the other legal books collated, as well as those of Ely, Oxford, and St. Paul's Cathedrals. He gives a careful description of each book, to which my space only allows me to refer the reader. I learn from the Records Office that his account needs a very few corrections. The Tower Book has now the Letters Patent, but not the Seal. The Common Pleas Book has no Letters Patent, but the Chancery Book has still its Great Seal. In each case Dr. Stephens mentions the beautiful binding—*e.g.*, [King's Bench] crimson morocco or perhaps calf, leaves gilt-edged, much gilt tooling on back and covers, Royal Cypher in gold seven times on back, and four times on each cover, "For the King's Bench," with Royal Arms, etc., in the middle of each cover, etc. It is interesting to compare with this, "delivered" at the expense of the nation, the plain bindings of the books which each Cathedral had to "obtain" for itself, and pay for, probably with some difficulty, in 1662.

Now let us return to the Cathedral copies. Dr. Goulburn, then Dean of Norwich, in his *Collects* (1880), has an interesting note (I., 182). He says he is curious to know how many of the Cathedrals have preserved their books. He is sure about eight. He adds that the Rev. J. H. Blunt ("no mean authority") *thought* there were books at York, and at Worcester (none there now) and in most of the Cathedrals. But Dean Goulburn had been told by the Librarian of Salisbury that their copy was missing (it is there now).

I will now, under the head of each Cathedral, give the information given to me a few years ago by the Cathedral authorities, information which is first-hand and up-to-date. In a few cases I have supplemented this by information given by Dr. Stephens and Dean Goulburn.

CANTERBURY.—Book in Cathedral Library, and Great Seal with it. Certificate signed by five Commissioners.

YORK.—Great Seal still with book, and both in excellent state of preservation. Certificate signed by six Commissioners.

ST. PAUL'S.—During the war book hidden in crypt. Great Seal there, but wax somewhat broken. Certificate signed by eight Commissioners. Binding, of dark rough calf, appears to

be original, back slightly broken, and the Cross Swords of the Chapter are on the cover in gold. Letters Patent attached to Great Seal. Edges of leaves red, and red lines ruled round the text. Letters Patent and tin box containing Seal were, in 1849, attached by four larger and two smaller twisted silk cords, and probably are still.

WINCHESTER.—Book kept in locked case in Library. Letters Patent remain, but Seal has disappeared (in 1880 Dean Goulburn found only a fragment). Certificate signed by five Commissioners. Name of Cathedral not stamped on binding.

DURHAM.—Before the war book kept in Library in oak box, apparently coeval with it. During the war removed to fireproof safe, of which the Dean kept the key, and it could be examined only in his presence. Original binding of plain brown leather, without any ornamentation or stamping. The word "Durham" is *written* on cover. Red lines round text, apparently ruled in by hand. Great Seal and Letters Patent in good order. An excellent photograph of book, etc., is given as frontispiece to Vol. II. of Blunt's *Prayer-Book* (first edition, 1872). Certificate signed by seven Commissioners.

ELY.—Book kept in Muniment Room in chest with three keys, of which the Dean has one. In admirable condition. Bound in rough brown calf. Word "Ely" *written* (old English) on cover. Great Seal in dilapidated condition (about one-third left), but still attached to book and to Letters Patent by tape of five green cords. Certificate signed by five Commissioners.

NORWICH.—Binding apparently original. No name on cover. Letters Patent and Great Seal in tin box, still attached to book. Certificate signed by six Commissioners, one being the Dean (Croftes).

LINCOLN.—Book remains, but only part of Great Seal. Certificate signed by five Commissioners.

OXFORD.—Book in Chapter House. Bound in rough calf, quite plainly, but with a little gilding on the edges, leaves lightly marbled. On cover, stamped in black, are the words "Christ's Church, Oxford." Letters Patent and Great Seal remain, but detached, cord being broken. Certificate signed by seven Commissioners, one being the Dean (Allestree), who signed on no other occasion.

ST. ASAPH.—Book in Library, the only surviving copy in Wales. Nice clean copy, never or hardly ever used. Original strong binding of reddish-brown leather, with fairly wide gold bordering round both covers. On the back, running down in gold letters, are the words, "The Seal-Book of Common Prayer, Saint-Asaph Chapter. MDCLXII." Great Seal gone. Certificate signed by six Commissioners.

HEREFORD.—Book in Library. Great Seal missing, but Letters Patent remain, and have been framed. Word "Hereford" written in ink on cover. Binding apparently original. Certificate signed by six Commissioners.

GLOUCESTER.—Book in Library. Seal imperfect. Certificate signed by six Commissioners.

LICHFIELD.—Book remains. Great Seal somewhat broken. Certificate signed by seven Commissioners, including the Dean (Paule).

SALISBURY.—Book bound in whole rough calf with three labels.

COMMON
PRAYER

CHURCH OF SARUM
CERTIFIED COPY
BY
STAT. XIV. CAROLI II.

1622

(sic, for 1662).

Great Seal gone, but its green silk braid (flat, not round), fairly thick, remains. Marbled edges, slightly cut. Letters Patent remain. Certificate signed by seven Commissioners.

EXETER.—Book remains, and with it Great Seal, in a tin box, but somewhat broken, though all fragments there. Certificate signed by four Commissioners.

CARLISLE.—Book remains and Great Seal. Certificate signed by six Commissioners.

CHICHESTER.—Book remains. Great Seal gone. Certificate signed by six Commissioners, one being the Dean (Henshaw).

ROCHESTER.—Book in strong-room, which is very full, but in good order. Probably rebound. Present binding much like that of Bishops' Registers, rebound c. 1750. Great Seal in excellent condition, once cut off, but afterwards reattached with pins. Certificate signed by six Commissioners.

Dean Luckock (*Studies*, p. 198) says that each Cathedral was ordered to have "its name legibly stamped on the cover" of its Sealed Book. He gives no authority for this statement, and I can find none. It was not so in fact.

So much for the Cathedrals. Now let us try to account for the eight missing books. I can speak for four. The other four baffle me altogether.

1. CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.—There is a copy here. It has the certificate signed and sealed by six Commissioners, but no Great Seal, etc. It was collated with the Tower copy in 1831 by John Bayley. Rebound about 1830 (?). The book

formerly stood with those from the Moore Library, but they have no other record. Moore, first Bishop of Norwich, then of Ely, was a great book collector. After his death George I. purchased many of his books and gave them to this Library. The Sealed Book probably was amongst them. If so, the Bishop must have obtained it from one of the Cathedrals now without one, but not from Ely or Norwich. It is curious to note that so early as that (Moore died in 1715), or within fifty years of the Act, some Cathedral had either lost or sold its copy, which was to have been "preserved in safety for ever" and produced when wanted, and a book-collecting Bishop had obtained it.

2. ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, AUCKLAND, NEW ZEALAND.—I believe there is a copy here. Archdeacon Williams has described it to me. There is no certificate (that might easily have been lost), but the size of the pages and margins exactly agree with the Ampton copy. So also do the MS. corrections and the watermarks. So does the page on which the Collect "O God, whose Nature," etc., is printed on paper of a different texture, and in inferior type, and inserted later (*cf.* Stephens, *op. cit.*, I., clxxx.). This seems a great sign of genuineness, and occurs in all the books. The book is a folio of 1662, London, King's Printer, black-letter; the title-page is an architectural design with open book above, evidently like the Chancery copy by Loggan. Rebound in leather. The flyleaf has two inscriptions: (1) "Anne Leicester, May 12th, 1753." (2) "A Gift bestowed on the Right Reverend Andrew McFarlane by Willm. Rose, Mount Coffer, 21 Oct. 1794." Mount Coffer is a seat in north-east Banffshire. Bishop Andrew McFarlane was consecrated in 1787 as Coadjutor Bishop of Moray. Later in the same year he succeeded to the united Dioceses of Moray, Ross, and Argyle. He died in 1819. Bishop George Selwyn is said to have taken this book to Auckland in 1841, and to have left it there with other books in 1871. How he obtained it there is no one left to tell, and there is no record of what had happened to it after Bishop McFarlane's death. It had evidently "strayed" from its proper Cathedral before 1753.

3. THE "WELBECK" SEALED BOOK.—Some years ago I learned of the existence of another copy of the Sealed Book, and got some particulars about it written in 1885. But I failed altogether to trace its present whereabouts. But, following a kind suggestion from the editor of THEOLOGY, I have only just now found from the librarian of Welbeck Abbey that this copy is in the Library there, well cared for and valued. It is bound in rough calf, with a blind panel pattern stamped on each cover. The binding seems to be the original one, but the

volume has been carefully rebacked. This must have been done comparatively recently, for the first description I had found of it, dated some forty years ago, spoke of it as "broken."

It is supposed to have been placed in the Library at Welbeck by Edward Harley, second Earl of Oxford, though there is no record of how he obtained it. He was the son of Robert Harley, the founder of the Harleian Collection in the British Museum. His librarian, Humfrey Wanley, was an energetic collector of books from church and college and civic dignitaries. Lady Margaret Harley, his only daughter and heir, was married in 1734 to the second Duke of Portland, and she probably brought this book, together with Welbeck Abbey, to the Dukes of Portland. She died in 1785. The book is in good condition, and has still its certificate signed by six of the Royal Commissioners. Of course there is no trace of the Great Seal, which must once have been attached to it by a tape or cord.

But the great interest of this copy lies in the fact that written in ink on the top cover is the word "Westminster." This was the way in which most of the Cathedral copies were marked. So we shall be safe in concluding that this copy originally belonged to Westminster Abbey. In reply to my written enquiry in 1918, I was informed by a Canon of Westminster that they had nothing of the kind at the Abbey. A similar reply was received from all the churches which were Collegiate in 1662. So I concluded that no Collegiate Church (difficult as was this conclusion in the case of Westminster) had complied with the order of the Caroline Act of Uniformity and obtained the book. That such a Chapter as Westminster could have parted with such an important legal record, probably in less than three-quarters of a century, never came into my head. I therefore, not unnaturally, concluded that only thirty-one Sealed Books came into existence, twenty-six in Cathedrals, and five in Tower and Law Courts. To these must now be added this "Welbeck-Westminster" copy, making the total, so far as at present is known, thirty-two.

4. THE AMPTON SEALED BOOK.—The book was here in 1814, when Sir Thomas Gage saw it and recorded the fact in his MS. book on the Churches in Thedwastre Hundred, now at Hengrave Hall, Suffolk. It was missing for some years, but was here again at any rate in 1846, when it was rebound at the cost of Mr. Augustine Page, a well-known Suffolk antiquary. He spared no expense, and the work was done by F. Lankester of Bury St. Edmunds. It is in white vellum with an abundance of gold tooling on the back and both covers. On the front cover are the words "Ampton Parish" in gold. The edges are red, and it is a beautiful book, which strongly appeals for careful

usage. The rebinding involved some cutting down, but, from measurements most kindly sent me by Chancellor Christopher Wordsworth of Salisbury of their book, still in its original binding though "marbled" since, I find that the binder, failing the grace of knowing that his cutting tool should never come near the precious pages, was very fairly conservative in his work. The greater part of the letterpress is in a perfect state of preservation. Unfortunately several pages, apparently ten, are wanting near the front of the book, and amongst them the title-page. This misfortune we share with the Common Pleas Book. Fortunately the certificate (December 13, 1662) remains, signed and sealed by six Commissioners. How this treasure came to us we do not know. I can only hazard what is a pure guess. Sir Henry Gough of Edgbaston married the heiress of the Calthorpes (c. 1788), who had owned Ampton. Edgbaston was then in the Diocese of Worcester. Worcester Cathedral has lost its Sealed Book. The Gough-Calthorpes *may* in some way have obtained possession of it, and have brought it to Ampton. There was a tradition long years ago that it came through the Calthorpes.

No "Book Annexed" attached to any of the earlier Prayer-Books is to be found in the Parliament Office, House of Lords, and probably, in the case of all but one, they never existed. The exception is the book of 1552. In the Second Act of Ed. VI. we read: "The Book of Common Prayer . . . the aforesaid Authority has annexed and joined it, so explained and perfected, to this present Statute." And again, "the book annexed to this Act." It is interesting to know from the Parliament Office, House of Lords, that there are signs on the parchment that originally the annex was stitched to the Act. It is no longer with the Act, and may be presumed to be lost. There are no signs of any annex having been fastened to any of the other Acts.

But there were, so far as I can discover, no "Sealed" Books earlier than the Caroline ones. These were a new thought; there was no precedent for them. They were a device to make certainty doubly sure, and to bring about a uniformity which should be absolute. They, and the rest of the machinery of the Act, were the result of the reaction from the extraordinary licence, in every direction save one, of the preceding years. It is a curious result that in 1849 Dr. Stephens dared to challenge the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge and the Queen's Printers to produce a single accurate copy of the Book of Common Prayer. He said that the inaccuracies were not in trifles only, but also in other very important matters, and were very numerous (*op. cit.*, I., Introduction, ccvij. ff.). In 1892 the

York Convocation issued a Report of a Committee of the Lower House entitled, "Deviations of Modern Editions of the Prayer-Book from the Text of the Sealed Books." This was published by the S.P.C.K., but is now out of print.

This is a remarkable comment upon the Caroline Act of Uniformity and its machinery.

W. A. WICKHAM.

THOUGHTS ON THE CRISIS

RARELY can an Archbishop of Canterbury have had to deal with a more difficult and delicate situation than that created by the Bishop of Birmingham; and rarely, we may add, can an Archbishop have served the Church better in his handling of it. In the complexity of issues which have marked the present crisis—with a Bishop posing as a martyr to his love for science, a Parliament besieged by malcontents over the Prayer Book, publicists on the look-out for trouble over the Malines Report, and the Church itself distracted by controversy—it would have been fatally easy, by saying one word too much or too little, to do more harm than good. Had the Bishop of Birmingham been content with the first scandalous utterance which provoked the crisis, it is possible that action by higher authority would have had to be delayed. As it was, he chose to follow up the indignant protests aroused by his action, culminating in Canon Bullock-Webster's intervention at St. Paul's Cathedral, by a studied repetition of the offence; and by publishing an open letter he called for an open reply. The reply was couched in the quiet language which bespeaks a great pastor of souls—the language of one who is accustomed to find the Lord, not in the wind, the earthquake, or the fire, but in the "still small voice." He showed that the Bishop of Birmingham could lay no claim to be "blazing a trail" on behalf of modern knowledge; he pointed out that in his open letter the Bishop had shifted his ground from the doctrine of the Real Presence to the doctrine of Transubstantiation; and he reminded him that a Bishop's office calls for scrupulous carefulness in word and act, if he would set forward the truth of the Gospel. The reproof was firm, restrained, complete. There, as this number goes to press, the matter rests. It remains to be seen whether the Bishop of Birmingham will take the obvious course of resigning his see.

Few of our readers, we imagine, will have felt other than shame and dismay as they have read the successive utterances of Dr. Barnes, which found their climax in the "dinner-hour address" at Birmingham Parish Church. The question forced

upon large numbers of both clergy and laity has been whether a Church where the Blessed Sacrament could be spoken of with such irreverence, such carelessness, such contumely, and so spoken of by a Bishop unrebuked, could continue to claim the allegiance and the love of Catholics.

So long as Dr. Barnes was without rebuke from higher authority, the Church and its episcopate seemed committed to a policy of tolerance which to many of us appeared to differ little from apostasy; and many would have had to consider what duty that fact laid upon them. Not the least of the services bestowed by the Archbishop's reply is that it removes that difficulty in principle, and lifts from the consciences of Church people an intolerable reproach.

There remain, however, many practical difficulties. One of them, the administration of the diocese of Birmingham, could be removed by the Bishop's resignation. But meanwhile it is impossible to see, as Dr. Gore has pointed out, how the Bishop can expect any compliance with his directions from his Catholic clergy or laity. The public knows now better than it knew before what the Church in Birmingham has suffered during the last few years. Scornful and cruel, the Bishop has shown himself not a shepherd but a wolf; and men cannot but feel that they will be betraying Christ if they yield to his rule. If peace and discipline are to be restored to the diocese, we think it will be necessary for the Archbishop to take over the administration of such parishes as cannot accept the jurisdiction of the present Bishop.

Prevention, however, is better than cure; and the Church is bound to insist now upon a reform in the method of appointing Bishops. It is certainly unfortunate, as Canon Streeter and the Bishop of Durham have pointed out in *The Times*, that energy should be withdrawn at this moment from the urgent moral tasks confronting the Church to questions of ecclesiastical organization. The issue, however, cannot be shirked. What hampers the Church in its pastoral work and moral witness is wrongful controversy, and its full energies can only be released when the causes of such controversy are removed. And we do not hesitate to say that the main cause of the present trouble is the intrusion of Parliament into the spiritual sphere. Whether we consider the Prayer Book or the diocese of Birmingham, the events of the last few years have revealed the cause of our discontent to be the presence of an alien element in the organism of the Body of Christ. The time has come for the Church to claim "the Crown rights of the Lord Jesus" in things spiritual, and to demand a new Concordat between Church and State which will give us equal liberties with the Church of Scotland.

We may then expect the order and peace which will enable us to discharge our duty to the nation.

There is, however, another reaction to the present controversy which is more immediately pressing and of wider and more practical concern. Religious controversy in the public Press is often mischievous and always of questionable value. At the same time, the present crisis has not only revealed the existence of an extraordinarily wide interest in Christian belief and practice; it has also shown what a large measure of support there is in the country at large for Catholic principles and ideals. That is the teacher's opportunity. For much of this support is as yet vague and uninstructed; and the effort to meet it with real teaching will discover a new receptiveness in the popular mind. Most of us have probably been astonished to find how many people were unaware that the Church had long since come to terms with science in regard to the early chapters of Genesis. We have to show them not only that this is so, but how it came about—viz., because the authority to which Christian belief appeals is not the verbal inerrancy of an inspired Book, but the living voice of the Church in which, and for which, the inspiration of the Book was given, and by which its words are to be interpreted. It is no accident, but rather in the logic of things, that the reconciliation of the Faith with science coincided with a progressive understanding of Catholicism in the Church of England.

And what is true of Scripture is true also of sacramental doctrine. Thoughtful persons can hardly deny either that the development of rites and ceremonies has of late years seriously outstripped both reading and teaching, or that much of the teaching given has been careless and uninformed. The words of the 28th Article on the subject of Transubstantiation are a masterpiece of theological criticism and are still valid; but the very complexity and technicality of the doctrine do at least ensure that those who teach it shall have passed through some mental discipline with regard to the Eucharist. Unfortunately that is not always the case in the Church of England with regard to the Real Presence. If the doctrine of Transubstantiation "overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament" through being too "spiritual" and denying the reality of the outward sign, the doctrine of the Real Presence may very easily be taught in a way which implies that the *res sacramenti* is corporeal or apprehensible by the senses. Such teaching does occur, and causes real scandal to devout worshippers.* It is often urged against

* A case was recently brought to our notice, when a preacher said: "If the veils of bread and wine were withdrawn, you would see our Lord's Body and Blood." But, of course, you would do nothing of the kind. The Lord's Body is discerned by faith in and through the elements. It is not hidden, as by a curtain, from the physical eye, but in its very nature invisible to it.

Transubstantiation that it ties up the truth of the Real Presence to a particular philosophical theory of it. That is a real objection; but it is to be noted that it is far less applicable to a situation where there is no question of formulating a dogma. And such is the case in the Church of England, where Receptionism is a permitted belief. There is, therefore, far less danger in giving to the doctrine of the Real Presence a philosophical formulation; while the positive advantages in the way of precise thought would be very great. Nor would this be the only advantage. Many must have felt during the recent discussions in the Press that they could have wished a less intimate and devotional term than "Real Presence" to be an issue in the dispute. It is not technical enough for the rough-and-tumble of a controversy waged in public. What believers in the Real Presence have needed is a term which was one step further removed from the heart of religion and in closer relation to philosophical thought.

There remains the question whether such a term is available. Some, no doubt, would answer that, since Transubstantiation has shown itself remarkably well equipped for preserving the truth of the Eucharist, that would be the best term to adopt in the Church of England too. That would be, however, to subordinate right thinking to convenience, and to lower the whole standard of respect for truth. The Anglican criticism of that doctrine still stands; and, as the Bishop of Manchester has shown in *Christus Veritas*, if the term can be used, it is only in a sense quite outside the scope of the definition itself. The Bishop of Manchester, however, pointed the way to another term to which these objections do not apply, though he did not himself go all the way to reach it. The term which he suggested was Convaluation—a term which is in line with the current value-philosophy, but which fails to express the element of change involved in consecration. It was therefore urged in *Essays Catholic and Critical* that Dr. Temple's own doctrine of the Real Presence really called for a more comprehensive expression; and the word Transvaluation was put forward. That is the word which, in our judgment, we want, and which will be found to express the truth of the Real Presence most adequately.

But we have somewhat digressed from our point, which was to emphasize the opportunity now given to the clergy and others for positive teaching. Public controversy in the Press at least means a new recognition on the part of a congregation, however simple or backward in wits, that the subjects on which their parson has taught them are live and large issues. And it is mostly with such congregations that the clergy of the Catholic

movement have to do. It is something of a disaster that the only kind of intelligence which the Crown is at present prepared to recognize is such as can be found among Liberal Evangelicals or Modernists; and that the continuous Catholic teaching which used to be available in the pulpits of Westminster Abbey and St. Paul's is now available no longer. In the long run, however, the demand for consistent and positive teaching of the Faith will make itself felt among the educated and will have to be met. In the meantime we can remember how often God has chosen the weak things of this world to confound the strong; and, remembering that, we shall honour even the least of His little ones by giving them the best instruction that we can.

THE EDITOR.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

The Church's Year (S.P.C.K., cloth, 2s., paper, 1s. net) is a compilation by the Rev. A. McCheane of Prayers for Holy Seasons and other Anniversaries, and is published in the series entitled "Manuals of the Inner Life." Not for many years, we think, has so choice a treasury of devotion, both for public and for private use, been offered to our people. It represents the very best type of English Catholic piety—a book to begin the Church's year with at Advent.

The Expositor's Year Book (Hodder and Stoughton, 10s. 6d. net), edited by Dr. James Moffatt, is now published for the second year, and offers "a complete account of all the work done during 1926 on the interpretation of the Bible and in Biblical theology." The claim is ambitious; but the range covered in these 300 pages is astonishingly large, extending to periodicals as well as books, and gaps would not easily be found. Dr. Moffatt has the help of three distinguished scholars in Dr. Box, Prof. T. H. Robinson, and Prof. Fulton of Aberdeen; and the essays of all these scholars, which accompany the bibliographies, give the reader a valuable bird's-eye view of what is being done in the various fields of theological study. So far as we know, this *Year-Book* stands alone of its kind among English publications. The criticism is scholarly, fair, and to the point, and the result thoroughly readable. The volume deserves a wide circulation.

We have received a copy of a paper prepared by the Rev. Gilbert Shaw, of St. Paul's College, Burgh, for the use of a School of Prayer, and entitled "Some Notes on Terminology to serve as an Introduction to the Study of Spiritual Writings." It is to be obtained of the A.P.R. Office, 243, Abbey House, Victoria St., S.W. 1, price 1s. 6d. These twenty-four pages, accompanied by an index at the end, bear witness to the steady spread of the devotional life in the Church, and will be found very useful to all who are concerned with kindling and guiding it.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

The Review of the Churches.

The October number contains a generous selection of the papers read at the Lausanne Conference on Faith and Order, together with editorial comments by Sir Henry Lunn on the same subject and an epilogue entitled "An Unreported Conversation on the Eucharist." The whole gives probably much the fullest information as to the Conference yet available, and makes the number one of outstanding interest.

Laudate.

The September number (vol. v., No. 19) of this quarterly magazine of the Benedictine Community of Nashdom (formerly of Pershore) is as learned and readable as usual. The Rev. K. D. Mackenzie contributes a thoughtful article on "The Idea of Catholicism," and is followed by Mr. H. J. W. Tillyard with a compact and detailed study of "The Hymn

'Stars of the Morning' and its Byzantine Melody." Under the curious title of "Turunda" the Abbot continues his profound and richly documented contributions to Eucharistic theology, with especial reference to *Essays Catholic and Critical* and its relation to Eastern-Orthodox thought. The article is one which the contributors to that volume will, no doubt, consider very seriously in future revisions of the book. A philosophical article entitled "What do I mean by 'I'?", the story of Becket's death well told, notes from Kumasi, and some reviews, bring a fascinating number to its close.

E. G. S.

Theologische Blätter.

The August number contains an interesting reprint of an address given by Dr. M. Dibelius last June at a meeting of the *Deutscher Wissenschaftler-Verband* in Heidelberg. The main point of the lecture is that primitive Christianity was, at first, far removed from the official world, both politically and religiously. For these and other reasons, Dr. Dibelius rejects the reference in Josephus to Christ (*Ant.*, xviii.) as a Christian interpolation, though he admits that Profs. Burkitt and Harnack have accepted the passage as substantially authentic.

Perhaps the most interesting part of the address is a careful analysis of the Slavonic text of Josephus' Jewish War, originally translated by Prof. A. Berendts, of Dorpat. The main features which he notices in the Slavonic version are its simplicity of style, its occasional inaccurate rendering of a possibly underlying Greek text, and the strong Messianic tone of the record. He infers that this last feature is due to Christian influence, because it was desired to give a wider scope to Christianity. It was only in later years that Christian tradition became itself a part of the history of the world.

The September number contains two interesting addresses. The first was pronounced by Prof. Deissmann on June 26, in honour of the late Prof. Bernhard Weiss, who was born in 1827 and died in 1918. Prof. Weiss is well known as the best representative of the orthodox-critical school of German theology in the nineteenth century, and as the author of a *Life of Christ* and other works on N.T. theology. The second is a report of an address given in Lausanne Cathedral by Prof. K. L. Schmidt at the Conference on Faith and Order, August 10, 1927. The subject is entitled "The Necessity of Christian Unity for the Presentation of Christian Truth." The Church, which has received the commission from her Lord to present Christian truth, is confronted with the problem of her manifold divisions. Such a world-conference will tend to remove this reproach and restore the unity of the Church militant, a unity which consists in the hope of the coming Kingdom of God.

October.—In an article entitled "The Christian Faith and the First Commandment," Dr. H. Müller criticizes an essay by Prof. K. Holl on Luther, which asserts that the reformer laid more stress on the first commandment than on Christ. Dr. Müller points out that Luther declared the Law to be worthless for justification. Faith in Christ is the true fulfilment of the first commandment, and Luther knows no other process of justification.

Prof. K. L. Schmidt refers again to the Conference of German evangelical theologians, to be held October 18th-21st, at Eisenach.

L. P.

Zeitschrift für die A. T. liche Wissenschaft. 1927. Heft 1/2.

This double number begins with a number of testimonies to the late editor, Professor Gressmann, who died at the early age of fifty on a lecturing tour in America. In three years he had raised the *Zeitschrift* to a position of international importance. The new editor is Prof. Hempel of Greifswald. T. H. ROBINSON writes on the modern view of the prophets. Three stages may be distinguished: (a) the utterances, generally ecstatic, of the prophets; (b) the written collections of such utterances, made by disciples; (c) the books themselves, incorporating traditions about the prophets' lives. DR. OESTERLEY sketches briefly the relation of the Egyptian Amem-em-hope to Hebrew literature. PROF. A. C. WELCH discusses the Passover, concluding that what made Josiah's passover noteworthy was the adoption of those features which appear in Deuteronomy, and were, like that Code, borrowed from Northern Israel, where the family feast had already been transferred to the Sanctuary. MOWINCKEL of Oslo has a very elaborate study of "the last words of David" (1 Sam. xxiii. 1-7); they are of the *māshāl* (proverbial) type and only superficially prophetic. He restores the text, which is recognized as being corrupt. His canon of restoration is most interesting. While doublets and glosses are a cause of corruption, they are far less significant than omissions. A Hebrew MS. was subject to defacement by fading or scaling of ink, the ravages of insects, etc., and it easily worked into holes at the folds. Scribes were continually confronted by lines which they could only omit. Add other obvious causes, such as carelessness, and it is clear that the present text is often shorter than the original; instead of emending obscure words we must generally ask what should be added to give them a meaning.

A. ALT studies the Galilean place-names in Jos. xix. and suggests that they are derived from an official list of the places in the Babylonian province of Megiddo. W. BAUMGARTNER gives a very thorough examination of the Aramaic of Daniel in the light of new sources. He rejects the common critical view that this is definitely Western-Aramaic, and concludes that the distinction between Western and Eastern Aramaic is not valid at this date. On other grounds he places the composition of the stories in their present form, so far as language is a guide, in the second or third century B.C., as against R. D. Wilson and C. Boutflower, though the stories themselves are earlier and of Eastern origin. STUMMER adduces parallels from Hittite sources to O.T. cult-practices, and HELLER of Budapest discusses Zech. xiv, which may be a very late addition to the book. Altogether a brilliant number.

W. K. L. C.

Journal of Religion. Vol. vii., No. 3.

"If our contact with the students and followers of St. Thomas Aquinas is honest and profoundly appreciative, as it should be, they will make us different from what we are. And we shall make them different, if they reciprocate our appreciation," says Professor H. N. Wieman in a review he contributes to No. 3 of the *Journal of Religion*. It is a pleasant thing to express appreciation both of Professor Wieman's own contribution to the Symposium on Religion, which is brought to a conclusion in this number, and of the able and scholarly article by Dr. Meek on the influence of other cultures upon Hebrew life and literature. Professor Wieman

appears correctly to diagnose the situation when he says that the moderns emphasize in their religion a moral and social code, while their fathers emphasized in it an explanation of the universe; but that religion really requires both. It would be with some natural hesitation that we should put God on a level with His universe, as Professor Wieman seems to do, but that "religion is the total outreach and far fling of human life toward maximum abundance" we should agree. Is it possible to see here the influence of Dr. Sorley (p. 516, *Moral Values and the Idea of God*)? Dr. Meek illustrates his contention that there was considerable interpenetration of culture in the old world, from Hebrew word-borrowing. He sees the influence of the Accadian language of Egyptian, Arabic, and Indo-Iranian in the Old Testament Scriptures. The Hebrew language is, in fact, so far composite that "many a difficult word or construction finds easy explanation when referred to the language to which it belongs and from which it came into Hebrew." He notes, too, the likeness between certain parts of the Book of Proverbs and the teaching of Amenophis, as of Psalms to other Egyptian writings. The Hebrew record of their sojourn in Egypt bears impress of a local colour not so much of Egypt of the time of the story as of Egypt in the ninth century. The article suggests that the sense of sin which is so prominent in much of the Old Testament record is the result of Babylonian influence, and that the peculiar phrase in Ecclesiastes, "under the sun," comes from Greece. It is rather sweeping, surely, to assert, as Dr. Meek does more than once, that "scholars are universally agreed today" upon this or that point; but an article which well repays close study ends very wisely with a warning that to suppose an interpenetration of culture in the ancient world is not to infer that the Hebrews obtained all their culture from other people. "Their relation to others is like that of Shakespeare to his predecessors." Whatever the Hebrews borrowed they made their own, and in them, as so often, the pupil surpassed the teacher. We are grateful, too, for an interesting account and translation of a Mexican Mystery Play which takes us back to a Spain of the sixteenth century.

H. S. MARSHALL.

NOTES

1. AN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY PARSON

[The following extract is taken from the note-book of a direct ancestor of mine, the Rev. Charles Jasper Selwyn, Vicar of Blockley in Worcestershire and Rector of Beverstone in Gloucestershire; and I am indebted to my cousin, the Rev. A. B. Selwyn, in whose possession the note-book now is, for a copy of it. The writer of the notes says on the first page that he was born on February 19, 1726, and baptized on March 5 following, and on the second page concludes the collect, "Prevent us, O Lord," etc. with the words: "in omnibus suis inceptis sic sincere et ex animo precatur Carolus Jasper Selwyn. Boulogne, August, 1750." The Rules, etc., which follow are dated 1757; and they give so different an impression of a country priest's ideals at that period from what is usually held that I think they may be of general interest. At the end is added a note by his son, Henry Charles, found lying loose in the note-book, and testifying to the quiet witness of the father's life.—E. G. S.]

1757.—RULES, MAXIMS, PRECEPTS AND CAUTIONS CONCERN^G A RIGHT CONDUCT IN THE MINISTERIAL OFFICE AND CARE OF A PARISH.

To keep the keys of the Church in my own possession, if possible to abolish the custom of burying in the church, but never to suffer it, without my leave first obtained.

To introduce monthly Communions, and Communions on all the Great Festivals.

To bring the Congregation to a decent Behaviour and proper observance of the Rubrical Directions in Divine Service.

To keep up the custom of perambulations on the Rogation Days, with proper Exhortations and Admonitions to the people, accord^d to the Injunctions of Q. Elizabeth.

At the Communion to place the Elements of Bread and Wine on the Table myself, agreeably to the Rubrick.

To observe all the Fasts of the Church.

To have service in the Church on all Saints Days, morning and evening, and on the Vigils preceding, and on all Wednesdays and Fridays in the morning, and on Saturdays in the evening.

To conform as nearly as possible to the prescribed Clerical Habit, at all times wearing a short Cassock, Band, and Rose.

Never to administer Baptism according to the Public Form in Private; nor in any Place but in the Church; nor at any time but during Divine Service, after the second Lesson.

To attend at all Vestries, and as much as in me lies, to promote a quiet decent Behaviour there, and see, that Justice be done to the Poor of the Parish, in all the Resolutions, and Determinations of those meetings.

To rouse the Churchwardens or proper officers to collect all the Briefs in the Church, on the Days in which they are read; or from House to House if so enjoin'd. To endorse on the back of the Briefs the day on which I receive them from the Churchwardens, and in the proper Place the sums collected upon them—and to keep a separate and private Account in my own Possession of the several collections on them.

To take care, that the Sexton observes the appointed times for ringing Bells before Service punctually, and never, if possible, to vary the Hours of beginning service. Likewise to see that he keeps the Church properly cleaned, and the Books, Linnen, etc., belonging to it in a decent manner.

* * * * *

[Another note records the writer's intention to admit any of his parishioners who so desire it to the daily prayers in his house.]

* * * * *

BLOCKLEY,

Wednesday, 10th Sept., 1794.

This day at half-past two o'clock p.m. my most dear and most truly honoured Father, drew his last breath, and departed this painfully mortal state in the surest hope of a joyful resurrection through the merits of his Saviour and Redeemer Jesus Christ whose faithful servant he hath been thro' the whole course of a most virtuous, exemplary, and truly Christian life. So, O God, may I live, so, my Saviour, may I die, when it shall please Thee to call me hence. Amen.

H. C. S.

appears correctly to diagnose the situation when he says that the moderns emphasize in their religion a moral and social code, while their fathers emphasized in it an explanation of the universe; but that religion really requires both. It would be with some natural hesitation that we should put God on a level with His universe, as Professor Wieman seems to do, but that "religion is the total outreach and far fling of human life toward maximum abundance" we should agree. Is it possible to see here the influence of Dr. Sorley (p. 516, *Moral Values and the Idea of God*)? Dr. Meek illustrates his contention that there was considerable interpenetration of culture in the old world, from Hebrew word-borrowing. He sees the influence of the Accadian language of Egyptian, Arabic, and Indo-Iranian in the Old Testament Scriptures. The Hebrew language is, in fact, so far composite that "many a difficult word or construction finds easy explanation when referred to the language to which it belongs and from which it came into Hebrew." He notes, too, the likeness between certain parts of the Book of Proverbs and the teaching of Amenophis, as of Psalms to other Egyptian writings. The Hebrew record of their sojourn in Egypt bears impress of a local colour not so much of Egypt of the time of the story as of Egypt in the ninth century. The article suggests that the sense of sin which is so prominent in much of the Old Testament record is the result of Babylonian influence, and that the peculiar phrase in Ecclesiastes, "under the sun," comes from Greece. It is rather sweeping, surely, to assert, as Dr. Meek does more than once, that "scholars are universally agreed today" upon this or that point; but an article which well repays close study ends very wisely with a warning that to suppose an interpenetration of culture in the ancient world is not to infer that the Hebrews obtained all their culture from other people. "Their relation to others is like that of Shakespeare to his predecessors." Whatever the Hebrews borrowed they made their own, and in them, as so often, the pupil surpassed the teacher. We are grateful, too, for an interesting account and translation of a Mexican Mystery Play which takes us back to a Spain of the sixteenth century.

H. S. MARSHALL.

NOTES

1. AN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY PARSON

[The following extract is taken from the note-book of a direct ancestor of mine, the Rev. Charles Jasper Selwyn, Vicar of Blockley in Worcestershire and Rector of Beverstone in Gloucestershire; and I am indebted to my cousin, the Rev. A. B. Selwyn, in whose possession the note-book now is, for a copy of it. The writer of the notes says on the first page that he was born on February 19, 1726, and baptized on March 5 following, and on the second page concludes the collect, "Prevent us, O Lord," etc. with the words: "in omnibus suis inceptis sic sincere et ex animo precatur Carolus Jasper Selwyn. Boulogne, August, 1750." The Rules, etc., which follow are dated 1757; and they give so different an impression of a country priest's ideals at that period from what is usually held that I think they may be of general interest. At the end is added a note by his son, Henry Charles, found lying loose in the note-book, and testifying to the quiet witness of the father's life.—E. G. S.]

1757.—RULES, MAXIMS, PRECEPTS AND CAUTIONS CONCERN^G A RIGHT CONDUCT IN THE MINISTERIAL OFFICE AND CARE OF A PARISH.

To keep the keys of the Church in my own possession, if possible to abolish the custom of burying in the church, but never to suffer it, without my leave first obtained.

To introduce monthly Communions, and Communions on all the Great Festivals.

To bring the Congregation to a decent Behaviour and proper observance of the Rubrical Directions in Divine Service.

To keep up the custom of perambulations on the Rogation Days, with proper Exhortations and Admonitions to the people, accord^d to the Injunctions of Q. Elizabeth.

At the Communion to place the Elements of Bread and Wine on the Table myself, agreeably to the Rubrick.

To observe all the Fasts of the Church.

To have service in the Church on all Saints Days, morning and evening, and on the Vigils preceding, and on all Wednesdays and Fridays in the morning, and on Saturdays in the evening.

To conform as nearly as possible to the prescribed Clerical Habit, at all times wearing a short Cassock, Band, and Rose.

Never to administer Baptism according to the Public Form in Private; nor in any Place but in the Church; nor at any time but during Divine Service, after the second Lesson.

To attend at all Vestries, and as much as in me lies, to promote a quiet decent Behaviour there, and see, that Justice be done to the Poor of the Parish, in all the Resolutions, and Determinations of those meetings.

To rouse the Churchwardens or proper officers to collect all the Briefs in the Church, on the Days in which they are read; or from House to House if so enjoin'd. To endorse on the back of the Briefs the day on which I receive them from the Churchwardens, and in the proper Place the sums collected upon them—and to keep a separate and private Account in my own Possession of the several collections on them.

To take care, that the Sexton observes the appointed times for ringing Bells before Service punctually, and never, if possible, to vary the Hours of beginning service. Likewise to see that he keeps the Church properly cleaned, and the Books, Linnen, etc., belonging to it in a decent manner.

* * * * *

[Another note records the writer's intention to admit any of his parishioners who so desire it to the daily prayers in his house.]

* * * * *

BLOCKLEY,

Wednesday, 10th Sept., 1794.

This day at half-past two o'clock p.m. my most dear and most truly honoured Father, drew his last breath, and departed this painfully mortal state in the surest hope of a joyful resurrection through the merits of his Saviour and Redeemer Jesus Christ whose faithful servant he hath been thro' the whole course of a most virtuous, exemplary, and truly Christian life. So, O God, may I live, so, my Saviour, may I die, when it shall please Thee to call me hence. Amen.

H. C. S.

2. THE RENEWAL OF PUBLIC WORSHIP IN PROTESTANT GERMANY.*

A book on Worship by R. Otto, giving the practical outcome of his famous theory of "the Holy" ("the Numinous"), deserves the attention of English Churchmen; the more so as he pays us the compliment of imitation in some respects. He is familiar with Anglican ways, and especially commends our "Book of Common Prayer," which enables a Captain to hold Sunday service at sea, while a German ship cannot observe Sunday unless a pastor is on board. He envies our psalm-singing and our short prayers of the collect type. In many ways he approves Catholic methods. A Protestant congregation is lost without its minister, whereas Catholics can at once get busy with the Rosary and Litanies. The bell should be rung, at the Lord's Prayer, to enable the sick and others debarred from attendance to join in the supreme moment of worship. The Lord's Prayer should be sung to the ancient melody; the old tones of the psalms should be restored; the laity ought to be used as servers in the Catholic manner, and the formal Church prayers are best recited in the collect fashion—the "cantilene." The Church's Year, strictly followed, each Sunday having its characteristic message, is necessary in order to save the congregation from the arbitrary choice of subject, prayers and hymns by the preacher.

Yet Otto is no Catholic. The main thing in public worship is still the proclamation of the Word, not the Eucharist. This idea of the Word—objective Truth with its august and living action on the hearers when mediated through the minister—is a noble feature in German Lutheranism and, unhappily, weak amongst ourselves, where the sermon is admired, criticised, or neglected, but seldom received as the voice of the Living God. But, in theory at least, we find no difficulty in practising a Ministry of the Word *and* Sacraments.

The book begins with an acute diagnosis of the present situation. The unchurched masses look on religion as a class affair. We may reply, If the Church is a class-Church it is your fault for standing aloof; but a more fundamental answer is needed. The real cure will come when education has so progressed that all classes receive the same training, and the separate schools of today have become a thing of the past. As regards methods, we must remember that the masses outside the Church have outgrown primitive naïveté and will never return to legendary ideas. We must clear away obsolete matter, not with the idea that we shall thereby win the people—we shall not—but as a preliminary step, because of our reverence for the truth. Religion can only win men by being other-worldly. Public worship cannot be made "attractive" to the outsider, and the attempt to make it so will deprive it of its message to those who want *religion*. Much can be done, however, negatively in removing hindrances and what is psychologically mistaken. The systematic appeal to feelings is already old-fashioned. Retreats, systematic meditation, brotherhoods, "spiritual exercises"—nothing could be more modern than these revived methods.

Otto's specific ideas in respect of liturgical reform hardly apply to

* *Zur Erneuerung und Ausgestaltung des Gottesdienstes*, von Rudolf Otto. Giessen. Töpelmann. 1925.

English Church life, but some of them are worth recording. The day of uniformity has passed. We must trust the Spirit and allow freedom of experiment within the Church. The problem is to retain the enthusiasm of the group without allowing it to degenerate into a sect. The pastor will therefore train groups within the congregation; for example, to introduce periods of silence in the ordinary service would be undesirable, but they are most valuable in group services. Extempore prayer should be encouraged *within the liturgical framework*. That is, the Prayerbook will prescribe the prayers for each Sunday, but a pastor with the gift of prayer will be allowed to substitute his own words for any given prayer, but not to omit the subject. The music of the Church must reflect the needs of the day. Therefore hymn-supplements containing modern words and tunes should be freely used. "Sing unto the Lord a new song" is a precept generally neglected. In a liturgical appendix Otto gives specimen services, some of which would be very helpful in England at week-night services. Their special features are the introduction of the deacon who plays a part as in the Eastern liturgy, and the responses of the congregation.

Some other remarks are worth quoting. The modern ministry expresses itself in many different ways; perhaps St. Paul, if he lived now, would found a newspaper. Theological education should be more practical, not only because Ethics are more needed in modern conditions than Hebrew, but because the University student needs a gradual initiation into the practical duties of life instead of merely continuing the theoretical studies of his school days. Religious teaching in all schools should be voluntary, for scholars as well as teachers. Few would seek exemption, and we should be spared the disastrous reaction from compulsory religion. A Bishop, freely elected because of his character and leadership, like a Republican President, is a far better expression of modern democracy than a consistory of pastors.

W. K. L. C.

REVIEWS

JOHN WYCLIF: A Study of the English Medieval Church. By H. B. Workman, D.Lit., D.D. Principal of Westminster College, Senator of London University. Oxford University Press. 2 vols. 30s.

It can be said at once that this is the best and most complete life of Wyclif that has yet been written, and it will long hold the field. Dr. Workman is a competent and enthusiastic scholar, who has made a name for himself by excellent work on the Early Persecutions and on the Monastic Ideal. His very useful two small but scholarly books—*The Dawn of the Reformation*, vol. i., *The Age of Wyclif*, vol. ii., *The Age of Hus* (Kelly, 1901 and 1902)—were both first-rate and had most useful notes and appendices; they proved that he had ample equipment and fitting insight for a larger work; and now when the Wyclif Society has finished its laborious work, he has been able to achieve it. As I have for myself long been a student of Wyclif and connected with the Society, and have also lately studied its publications afresh,* I am peculiarly able to appreciate the knowledge, industry, and devotion he has brought to his task. It is an excellent and fine piece of work. Also he does ample justice to his predecessors—Lewis, Shirley, Lechler, and Loserth.

The many difficult questions about the details of Wyclif's early life are fully and fairly discussed. The work would have gained by compression in some places, and incidental stories, such as that of Oxford and its University, Westbury-on-Trim, and so on are told at length, which, if it adds to the interest, yet a little disturbs the balance of the biography. The account of Wyclif's works is full and always interesting. Dr. Workman rightly rejects the description of Wyclif as the "morning star of the Reformation," but labels him as the first Nonconformist. Now whatever his opinions were (and he was very free and discursive in expression and criticism), he lived and died as a Conformist in practice. And this brings us to the final conception of Wyclif's character and place in history. It is this which many are now asking for and which can now, I think, be given. The Editor has kindly sent me a letter from the Rev. F. A. Heaton, of Tenterden, and it seems the easiest way of giving such a general idea to print his questions and try to answer them.

* I may refer to my *Note on the Work of the Wyclif Society in Essays in History*, presented by R. L. Poole, Oxford, 1927, to chap. ii., vol. ii., of the *Cambridge History of English Literature*, 1908, and also to the article on Wyclif in the *Dictionary of English Church History*.

"TO THE EDITOR OF 'THEOLOGY'"

"DEAR SIR,

"I have been reading the two volumes of Dr. Workman on John Wyclif. It would be an impertinence for me to praise such an exhaustive piece of work. I should imagine that this is one of those satisfying final books as far as research goes, research that the authority tells us has occupied some twelve years. As to the accuracy of the details I am incompetent to judge, but as a student venture to refer to you some queries and criticisms that came into my mind as to the judgments of the author.

"1. As regards Wyclif himself, one very strong impression remains: that he was first and last an intellectualist, the 'last of the schoolmen,' and by no means a missionary and evangelist. The author owns that he had no 'passion for souls,' which is not surprising in view of his idea of sin as but a negation. The second impression is that of inconsistency. It shows some hardihood to condemn plurality while being not only Rector of Lutterworth but also Prebendary of Aust and residing mainly at Oxford. And the same appears in his accepting a position in the Embassy to Bruges, while condemning the practice of clerics doing secular governmental work. The third impression is that there was a certain carelessness as to truth, a tendency to make wild statements, discoverable also in his disciples—*e.g.*, Purvey. And here I think a protest ought to be made against what is a rather flagrant piece of whitewashing. In vol. ii., p. 205, are these words: 'With characteristic exaggeration Wyclif writes as if some (of the "Poor Priests") had suffered death by burning or strangling.' Surely a different word from 'exaggeration' is due: and if it is really 'characteristic,' the character of Wyclif is so much the less admirable.

"2. As regards his views. The theory of 'dominion founded in grace' is obviously perfectly impractical. It meant that if lord or master were to be deemed 'sinful' no contract or undertaking with him need be kept. It introduced a complete dislocation of all society, sheer disorder, and antinomianism. Instead of reconsideration and revision of the ridiculous theory, Wyclif shows a certain stubbornness of mind and declares the theory must stand, but as things are 'God must obey the devil,' and we are no further forward. He cancels his own theory, and what he declares as a Divine ideal must give place to the overwhelming force or inertia of evil. It is pessimism surely of a most unchristian kind.

"It appears to me, as a student, that the condemnation of these and other teachings of Wyclif was most justly deserved. By the way, does it show adequate appreciation of the time to speak of the Blackfriars Council as 'packed'? From Dr. Workman's own careful analysis, it contained a body of the ablest men of the day to whom was entrusted the task of comparing Wyclif's teaching with the authoritative teaching of the Church. They carefully distinguished between teachings that were 'heretical' and those 'erroneous and against the decision of the Church.'

"3. As regards Wyclif's influence. No wonder that it was so transitory, as negative teaching always is. Such followers as Dr. Workman mentions do not make a very glorious company. He seems to have attracted to himself certain of the 'gentry' who display no pious evangelicalism born out of due time, but that rather dreadful irreverence that reappeared at fuller force during the Reformation—an irreverence that

could not be combined with any deep sense of the things of God. Judging by the recantations, the more actual followers do not appear conscious of having got hold of any very vital truth: and this is all the more noticeable, because the Church authorities showed great patience and leniency. It was not to be expected that the 'poor preachers' should be permitted to continue intruding into parishes without licence. I imagine that there is similar discipline in the present-day Nonconformist bodies. More rightly were the 'poor preachers' suppressed if they spread abroad the dangerous social ideals of their master.

"Dr. Workman regards Wyclif not as a forerunner of the Reformation, but as the 'stern, unbending forerunner and father of the Puritans, Covenanters, and Nonconformists.' Was he indeed the forerunner of anything? or was he not rather that pathetic thing—an exceedingly able intellect which just because of a temperamental cold-bloodedness and lack of passion for souls proved sterile and was so soon forgotten?"

1. Wyclif was pre-eminently a schoolman, with much knowledge although not original. But he was a very influential University teacher of the scholastic type. This meant much discussion carried on with great freedom. Such a method quickened the intellect but had many dangers on the side of religion and conviction. He never hesitated to attack accepted doctrines and views, and in the course of his life changed his opinions much, as he did, for instance, on Church government and on the Eucharist (on the latter he finally settled down into a denial of Transubstantiation because, as we would put it, it asserted the destruction of matter). This freedom of discussion, often slashing and violent, made him a popular lecturer and drew many devoted pupils around him. Hence his importance at Oxford.

But this did not imply any change in practice. University teachers were free in speech and thought, but accepted the working of the Church's worship and practice. And above the freedom of thought there was the authority of the Church to repress teaching and utterances which were dangerous. It was under this censure that Wyclif came, and he was silent in his later years. But he was never "a rebel" in his conformity. That was the normal practice of the Christian life and ministry which existed along with the free discussion of the University.

The medieval method of teaching naturally led to some inconsistency, not only of opinions as expressed from time to time, but also between speech and practice. Wyclif's career certainly shows him practising abuses (such as pluralities) which he condemned in theory. This was, of course, wrong, but the habits of a day always affect people. For instance, I myself have known many really good parish priests in the mid-nineteenth century who yet were pluralists, and I have known fervid Church reformers who were yet guilty in the same way.

2. Wyclif's utterances on social and ecclesiastical matters would have led to chaos. But intellectual theorists, especially perhaps in Universities, have always been rather unpractical and are often so today.

I do not for myself think that he was treated unfairly. We must guard against the presumptions that authority is always in the wrong and that heresy or eccentric teaching is always right. But in the process of dealing with Wyclif it was unfortunate that the self-government of the University, a real essential for its life, was damaged.

3. Wyclif was, I think, made use of by politicians, but his patriotism was certainly great. He had perhaps no "passion for souls," but he had a great love of the Scriptures. And he had a great desire to spread knowledge. I think for myself that his influence in England has been often overrated; his real sphere was Oxford, and he was a typical medieval teacher with the tendencies and defects of the medieval system. But perhaps because of his intense national feeling he looked beyond the University; his love of the Scriptures, his wish to spread knowledge widely, and his love of the common man, gave him distinction. A Northerner, with the roughness (perhaps the violence) of the independence of the North, is not always happy in the South.

J. P. WHITNEY.

CRANMER AND THE REFORMATION UNDER EDWARD VI. By C. H. Smyth. Cambridge University Press. 10s. 6d. net.

At first sight a comparison between Mr. Smyth's workmanlike essay and Canon Anthony Deane's brilliant study seems inevitable. But it is not so. Canon Deane's book covers the whole of Cranmer's life, and analyzes his character with skilful intimacy. It abounds with epigrams and judgments as shrewd as just. Cranmer "sincerely religious as he was, did many things which can only be described as infamous." The sentence is as true as it is severe. The time has certainly come when the partisanship of Anglicans should be silent when the first Reformation archbishop in England is studied, and Canon Deane's candour is equal to his careful research. Mr. Smyth is content with a smaller field, and to investigate it more minutely. He gives, it is true, a summary judgment. Cranmer was "the Samson Agonistes of the English Reformation . . . by his death he damned the Marian counter-Reformation, and lit, more signally than even Latimer and Ridley, a candle that should never be put out." One can but hope that in a more complete work Mr. Smyth will be able to illustrate and develop these judgments. For the present we must be content with a much

narrower investigation, patiently and admirably pursued. Cranmer is seen almost exclusively as he was under Edward VI. But as compensation we are given some excellent sketches which do not fall quite precisely within the limits of the book's title—that is, excellent studies of the English Reformers in Switzerland, and, better still, of Peter Martyr, of Hooper, of Bucer, and of John à Lasco. Each of these, of course, had real influence on Cranmer, but not, one is inclined to think, nearly so deep and enduring an influence as has sometimes been supposed. Mr. Smyth analyzes these influences on the Prayer Book of 1552—"a remarkable concession to the Sacramentarians, but not a complete surrender." But Cranmer was not exaggerating when he described himself (or more exactly allowed another to describe him—for surely it is the Archbishop who is meant), as "weak both in learning and in authority." The wonder really is not that Cranmer did so little, but that he did so much in the details of Reformation theology and organisation. Mr. Smyth's chapter on the Prayer Book is very good. It is naturally temperate, at a time when that Book is under a cloud; but Mr. Smyth considers the Book of 1549 to be "the most beautiful of Christian liturgies." The main object of the essay is to show exactly what Cranmer did under Edward VI. But there are two theses in it which are perhaps more interesting as they are certainly more emphatic. In the first of them Mr. Smyth, if we understand him rightly, does not seem to be quite consistent with himself. It is that "the most striking, indeed almost an unique feature of the Reformation under Edward VI., is the portentous fact that it was not governed by considerations of foreign policy." Perhaps the stress is meant to be on the word "governed"; if otherwise we should be disposed to reply that neither Henry VIII., nor, more conspicuously, Elizabeth, were led to their conclusions by foreign policy, and, indeed, that the reforming movement under Edward was far more foreign in sympathy than it was under the other sovereigns. Mr. Smyth considers that the Reformation in the first half of the sixteenth century "was not in any sense a popular movement," though on the following page he states that the destructive work under Henry VIII. (what else was there?) was popular. "There were no popular risings against the Six Articles of 1539, as there had been against Cromwell's Injunctions and the Ten Articles of 1539, and as there were to be against the English Prayer Book of 1549." As to what actually happened we believe that Bucer's *De Regno Christi* (quoted by Mr. Smyth) is more convincing than Mr. Smyth's view that England was "converted from Catholicism by the Spanish match." The second thesis is that Cranmer was not inconsistent in his sacramental doctrine.

Mr. Smyth believes that this was always "Suvermerian," and that "the mass of Cranmer's Reformation work must be dismissed as worthless unless the whole body of it can be regarded as coherent." Cranmer was a consistent disciple of Bucer and the Strassburg school. The thesis seems to us to need much more support than it was possible for Mr. Smyth to give in a university prize essay. It is perhaps significant that the very word does not appear, we think, in Canon Deane's book.

W. H. HUTTON.

NOTICES

ST. HUGH OF LINCOLN. By R. M. Woolley, D.D. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

This biography, if tested by the standard of making its subject interesting, is surely a good biography. In addition, the book is both reassuring and stimulating: reassuring, in that it adds immensely to the reader's comfort to have so deft a handling of the sources and so discriminating an author; and stimulating, in that the life of St. Hugh is edifying in the best sense. He was a rich person; the genuine piety of his early years never evaporated, leaving behind a spiritual monument of formalism; his sense of humour and his keen wit served to invest a commonplace situation with a filmy shower of sparks; his unswerving devotion to principle and ideals bespoke that sincerity and reality which was so eminent a part of his character. Even where the Saint—mediaeval to the finger-tips—indulges in his dubious methods of "scrounging" relics (cf. pp. 113-114), he is more than plausible—he is convincing!

By all odds, the most illuminating passages are those which have to do with St. Hugh and the various sovereigns under whom he lived. The daring boldness of his resistance to what he deemed royal interference is as breath-taking as the startling originality of his solution of an apparent deadlock. When Hugh took over the newly established Charterhouse in 1179 he had to see that King Henry supplied the promised aid for the poverty-stricken community. Instead of upbraiding the King, he thus answered the King's question: "What are you meditating so thoughtfully? . . . Do you too propose to depart?" "I do not so despair of you, Lord; nay, rather, I sympathize with you in your hindrances and busy occupations. . . . Though you are so much occupied, yet with God's help you will complete that which you have so well begun." Small wonder is it that the King became his friend in this and other matters. Later, having fallen out of favour with the same Henry (after he had become Bishop of Lincoln), the King deigned to snub him well when he presented himself. "Hugh duly appeared on the scene. . . . No one looked up. . . . Hugh gazed on the company for a minute or two, and then, walking up to the noble who sat next to Henry, took him by the shoulders and gently moved him aside, sitting himself down . . . next to the King. Still a deep silence reigned, till at last the King asked for a needle and thread and begged to sew a rag around a damaged finger. . . . The good

Bishop saw and understood the meaning of it all, and as he sat there watching the King, spoke out a thought that came into his mind: 'How you take after your kinsmen of Falaise!' " (pp. 86-87). The King could not but laugh, and the tension was dissolved immediately. The dangerous allusion so boldly spoken was to the mother of William the Conqueror (Henry's great-grandfather), who came of lowly stock and was born at Falaise in Normandy, a town renowned for its tanning industry.

Hugh is an attractive person in every way, and his life is attractively told. Like his subject, who would never have held himself inaccessibly aloof, Canon Woolley's intimate picture brings home to the sympathetic understanding of the reader the true greatness of Hugh of Lincoln.

F. GAVIN.

INDIAN PHILOSOPHY. Vol. II. By S. Radhakrishnan. Allen and Unwin. 25s.

In the first volume of this large-scale survey of Indian Philosophy Professor Radhakrishnan carried the story down to the time of the decay of Buddhism. Resuming at that point, he now completes his task by dealing at length with the six Brahmanical systems and more briefly with the Saiva, the Sakta, and the later Vaisnava systems, which, as he says, "belong more to the religious history than to the philosophical development of India." The well-written summaries of the tenets of the various schools are clear and reliable, the work is admirably proportioned, and it must be regarded as a very considerable achievement to have succeeded in presenting as a unity in the two volumes so prolonged a sequence of thought including so many diverse systems.

The author, who is the King George V. Professor of Philosophy in the University of Calcutta, finds that the more intellectual of his countrymen are disposed either to entrench themselves in the scholasticism of a bygone age or to abandon completely the products of the minds of their own forefathers so as to be free to adopt the thought of the West. He desires, and the desire is clearly the begetter of his book, to convince them of the value of Indian thought in the past and at the same time to remind them of the necessity of carrying it fearlessly forward. "The chief energies of the thinking Indians should be thrown into the problems of how to disentangle the old faith from its temporary accretions, how to bring religion into line with the spirit of science, how to meet and interpret the claims of temperament and individuality, how to organize the divergent influences on the basis of an ancient faith. . . . If, before it is too late, there is a reorganization of national life, there is a future for Indian thought; and one cannot tell what flowers may yet bloom, what fruits may yet ripen on the hardy old trees" (p. 777 f.). He commends the work of Gandhi and Tagore, of Aurobindo Ghosh and of Bhagawan Das: yet on the whole he is convinced that "India is no longer playing her historic rôle as the vanguard of higher knowledge in Asia" (p. 771). The results of Professor Radhakrishnan's laudable efforts to revivify Indian philosophy will be of the deepest concern not only to the people of India but also to the Church of Christ; and it is clear that his work merits the close attention of religious thinkers and teachers in the West as well as of academic students of philosophy.

O. HARDMAN.

ADVENTUROUS RELIGION. By H. E. Fosdick, D.D. S.C.M. 6s.

A very stimulating collection of essays, characterized by wide range of thought and illustration and by impatience of the merely traditional. Dr. Fosdick is a Liberal Christian. He is deeply concerned about the rise of Fundamentalism in America, with its foolish slogans, such as "God or Gorilla." He has many pointed and pungent criticisms of the reactionary and obscurantist basis of the Fundamentalist position. He is equally emphatic against some exorbitant claims, on behalf of Science, outside Science's legitimate sphere. A valuable chapter analyzes the assertion, "God becomes progressively less essential to the running of the Universe." Another chapter is devoted to "Science and Mystery." Here he exposes, by the aid of the real scientists, the idea that religion deals with mysteries and that Science is progressively exposing them. The Universe, as viewed in the twentieth century, is admittedly more mysterious than the little and simple Universe imagined five hundred years ago. He holds lightly to creeds and formulas—too lightly, some of us would judge. They are, as it were, the flywheel, in which spiritual thought and energy is stored, and by their momentum produce steady and sustained movement. I do not press the metaphor, which is admittedly too mechanical. He rightly recalls us to the fact that Christianity began as a movement and an adventure, and that too much spiritual energy may be spent in ways that do not increase spiritual life. He points to the weakness of Liberal Christianity, that it tends to be over-intellectual and under-spiritual. That is obviously not the failing of the writer. He is alive to both the spiritual and the intellectual issues.

H. LOVELL CLARKE.

MEDITATION AND MENTAL PRAYER. By Wilfred L. Knox, M.A. Philip Allan. 3s. 6d.

This little book is singularly complete within the limits imposed by its subject-matter—namely, "ordinary" as distinguished from "extraordinary" prayer. Its merits by no means lie upon the surface; and in spite of its apparently elementary character, it will repay careful study alike by those who try to teach and those who try to practise Christian spirituality. It deals simply and clearly with meditation, "forced acts," aspirations, and that prayer of simplicity or "simple regard" which is generally considered to be the highest of the active degrees of prayer. The account of the difference between "forced acts" and aspirations—a difference as much psychological as religious, which beginners find hard to understand—is particularly good, and anyone who has worked carefully through this section will have gained the necessary foundation for a proper understanding of the classic works on mental prayer, such as Baker's *Holy Wisdom*. Father Knox has a great gift for fresh and realistic restatement. It would be hard to find a better introduction to formal meditation than that which he gives. He shows very plainly its use not only in the development and feeding of the religious consciousness by means of the discursive reason, but also in the incitement of the will to fervour by a perpetual representation of the Christian standard of perfection. Moreover, he clears away the difficulties caused by the elaborate and rigid schemes found in many textbooks, reminding us that these are to be regarded as analyses rather than rules; and provides some excellent examples of skeleton meditations based on the Ignatian method.

Father Knox keeps close to experience, and does not demand impossibilities from those for whom he writes. Meditations of five or ten minutes, three or four times a week, are all he asks of beginners. On the other hand, he allows no loopholes for the religious day-dreamer and sentimentalist. The first is reminded that "it is curious how easy it is for us to assume that the laziest method is that which suits our temperament best in matters of religion." The second is directed to the ultimate aim of all mental prayer—the bracing and purifying of the dedicated will. "If our one idea of religion is to make it a comfortable and soothing luxury, we shall be very unwise to attempt the practice of mental prayer."

After a very practical treatment of the subject of "distractions," insisting on the uselessness of direct resistance, the book ends with a brief—perhaps too brief—account of the "prayer of simplicity." This emphasizes the fact that such prayer, with its progressive unification of consciousness, is a perfectly normal development of the devotional life, and should neither be regarded as the special prerogative of "mystical temperaments" nor distrusted as a temptation to religious laziness.

E. UNDERHILL.

EARLY CHRISTIANS OF ROME. By G. M. Bevan, S.Th. S.P.C.K. Paper, 2s. 6d.; cloth, 4s.

In his foreword to this most interesting book, Dr. Lock says: "It is very readable and lucid, and based upon a wide reading in the primary authorities on the subject with which it deals. It will be invaluable to the visitor to Rome. . . ."

The chapters include those on life in Imperial Rome, and the Religions of Rome, with descriptions of the Temples of Vesta, Jupiter Capitolinus, and of the ceremonies in connection with the worship of Magna Mater, Isis and Serapis, and Mithra.

These chapters are followed by detailed accounts of the conditions of life in the early Church, illustrated by Catacomb inscriptions (Jewish and Christian), frescoes, pictures on sepulchral monuments, and many quotations from the writings of the early Fathers, which throw light upon the faith and customs of the early Christians. Christian symbols, such as Orpheus, the Fish, the Orante, and the Peacock, are explained, and also the significance of the many scenes depicted on the sarcophagi from the Old and New Testaments.

Chapter XI. is especially concerned with the inscriptions and frescoes relating to the Sacraments.

The concluding chapter contains a short account of later Christian art, with descriptions of the mosaics in St. John Lateran and in St. Clemente. A useful Bibliography is added for the use of students.

M. P. CRIGHTON.

THE NATURE OF DEITY. By J. E. Turner, Ph.D. Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 10s.

In his previous volume, *Personality and Reality*, Dr. Turner argued that the real existence of the Supreme Self or Deity could be logically established from the *data* presented by those outstanding characteristics of the universe which have been discovered by modern science. To those who

are prepared to follow him in this break from the almost dogmatic assumption that no logical inference from Nature to God is possible, the sequel on *The Nature of Deity* will prove to be of peculiar interest and a welcome addition to the many efforts now being made in defence of Theism, in the full light of modern science and philosophical speculation. Making, so he claims, no appeal to any presuppositions nor philosophical postulates, and basing his conclusions on what appear to him to be the broad facts of the situation, Dr. Turner traverses a wide field in his effort to attain to a concept of the Universe or Whole which satisfies the philosophic demand for singleness combined with all-inclusiveness, and lays due insistence on the absolute supremacy, and therefore on the distinction from all else, of personal Deity.

He begins with the problem of the nature of the relation between the Supreme Self and the remainder of the universe with which he coexists, employing the term "universe" to denote all-inclusive real being, within which this Self is the irresistibly dominating factor, using as alternatives having the same significance the terms "Whole" or "Absolute." Arguing strictly from the known to the unknown, Dr. Turner finds in the nature of human personality, considered always in its relatedness to its environment, and particularly in the truth that the self's responsiveness develops into an increasing dominance as it advances to ever higher levels, a key to the nature of Deity. Pursuing this clue, he deduces the nature of the Supreme Self viewed in its relation to the universe in a way to conserve at once the values suggested by the complementary terms "transcendence" and "immanence." He is clear that the principle of transcendence must in one way be uncompromisingly maintained, yet it must not be carried to the deistic or Aristotelian extreme. At the same time the lurking danger of Pantheism which haunts every attempt to express the unity of all existence must be avoided. Such is the heroic enterprise upon which Dr. Turner embarks, fully conscious of the dangers to be faced, the obstacles to be avoided, and the warnings from the sad tales of the shipwreck of former mariners.

There are chapters on Infinity and Perfection; Omniscience and Omnipotence; Divine Purpose: Pain and Evil; The Method of Divine Purpose: Creation; Creation and Divine Love; Divine Holiness. He contends for a fundamental distinction between Deity and the rest of the universe, a distinction which, because it is essentially a self-distinction, conserves transcendence whilst allowing for immanence. He finds room for the attributes of omniscience and omnipotence, not in the sense in which Spinoza and others employed them, but as closely connecting them with finite power and knowledge. These divine qualities express themselves in a purpose to whose perfection even pain and evil ultimately contribute; while purpose, omnipotence, and omniscience are regarded as the associated aspects of an infinite experience to which the corresponding features in human nature are only far-distant approximations, conditioned always by the limitations inseparable from their origin and evolution.

There are four concluding chapters on Man and Deity, covering the idea of the Divine Supremacy; Evil and Atonement; Emotion and Reason; the Divine Fatherhood.

There are various points in the course of the development of Dr. Turner's argument where we should like to call a halt and put in a query. Questions of space, however, preclude any attempt at criticism. That Deity is immanent throughout all existence, in spite of His inherent self-distinc-

tion from the rest of being, is a theistic position of immense strength for Christian apologetics, if it can be successfully maintained. Many have attempted to defend such a position. There are features in Dr. Turner's effort which are distinctly stimulating. No student of the philosophy of religion ought to miss reading Dr. Turner's contributions. He has been steadily building up a reputation as a clear thinker with a charm of style which makes all he writes a welcome change from much philosophical jargon in which some professional philosophers still insist in concealing their contributions to thought. Those who will be at pains to study closely the cumulative argument in *Personality and Reality* and its sequel on *The Nature of Deity* will find themselves in possession of one of the best-written and most ably argued contributions to the subject in recent times.

H. M. RELTON.

WESTMINSTER COMMENTARIES: THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

By H. L. Goudge, D.D. Methuen. 12s. 6d.

A commentator contributing to a series of commentaries on the New Testament of the character of the Westminster series is in a position of some difficulty. His work must not be so strictly technical as to appeal to none but professional scholars; on the other hand, it must not be so completely out of touch with modern developments in the field of N.T. criticism as to be useless to the student who wishes to use it as an introduction to this field. The former danger Dr. Goudge has certainly avoided. On the other hand, it may be doubted whether he has not allowed his desire to do full justice to the devotional value of the Epistle (one of the richest of all the Pauline writings in this respect), to lead him into ignoring certain aspects of it which the modern student cannot afford to leave out of sight.

After all, the great question of modern criticism of the N.T. is the influences, whether Jewish or Hellenistic, which led the Apostles to see in the crucified and risen Jesus a Lord and a Redeemer. Nor is this a merely academic question; for the question which exercises the minds of a large number of modern Christians and semi-Christians is the question of whether we can ultimately justify their action in doing so and follow their example in seeing in the historical Jesus the full and supreme revelation of God. The whole range of problems which this issue raises is hardly noticed; it is assumed that the orthodox answer is already accepted by the reader. Possibly the assumption is right as far as the reader is concerned; but it would surely have been of value to him to have at his disposal a thorough investigation of the arguments commonly used to support the thesis that in calling Jesus Lord His disciples were transforming Christianity into a Hellenistic mystery-cult. In other words, was St. Paul right?—and if at all, how far was he right in saying, "Yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more"? The whole of chapters iv. and v. of this Epistle are the battle-ground of criticism; but Reitzenstein is merely dismissed in a line and Bousset is ignored.

Again, it could be wished that Dr. Goudge had not felt it necessary to defend so strongly the really untenable view that the last four chapters of the Epistle belong to their present place. His defence of this view is perhaps the weakest piece of work in the book.

But it would be ungenerous and misleading to allow these failings to obscure the great positive value of Dr. Goudge's work. He has produced a modern devotional and exegetical commentary of the first order, in which

the life and teaching of St. Paul are very clearly brought out in their relation to the religious life of the present day. The working parish priest or the student who wishes to learn what message St. Paul has for his own life will find in this commentary exactly what he needs. And it may be hoped that he will be led by it to study an Epistle whose riches are often strangely ignored.

WILFRED L. KNOX.

THE YOUNG ENGLISHMAN. A Study by Francis Underhill, Warden of Liddon House. A. R. Mowbray and Co., Ltd., London and Oxford. 4s. 6d. net.

The publishers describe this book as "A sympathetic and penetrating study of the younger generation of today, especially in its religious and social aspects, by an Anglo-Catholic priest who has had special opportunities of observation," and there is much more truth in the statement than there is in most publishers' advertisements. Indeed, the book is deeply, even enthrallingly, interesting, and the thought with which one leaves it is that the author should certainly write a much longer and more complete study of the subject.

Mr. Underhill thinks that today is "the triumph of youth," and on the whole, I think, he believes that a very dangerous triumph it is. It is only right that he should dwell on the dangers, on the escapades, and the sins of the young people of the twentieth century. But he is very far from being a pessimist. He is always, like Dr. Johnson's friend, letting cheerfulness break in. And so one accepts his judgments and his advice with the more readiness. The criticism of public school religion is extremely severe, and, on the whole, it is justified. But, as he would say, there is, under a general similarity, a great deal of distinction between school and school: I am inclined to think that more than anything else this depends on the nature of preparation for confirmation and of the person who prepares. I will pick out one passage from much that I should like to quote: "I tremble as I write, knowing perfectly well into what a bed of thorns I am casting myself; but I suggest that elementary theology and the practice of prayer should be taught to British boys at school. Theology is the science of the knowledge of God. Is it less important than History, or Greek, or Mathematics? Surely an elementary grounding in such a science should be a vitally important part of the curriculum of every school. Yet what time and trouble are given to it at most public schools, compared with that given to the studies which I have mentioned above? And are the boys at any public school instructed in the art of prayer? I hope so; in my day, at my school, certainly we were not. I said my prayers, as most of the other boys did; but no one ever asked me what I prayed, or suggested that help from some one older and more experienced than myself might be a help to me in the difficult ways of school life."

Perhaps the most alarming feature of the outlook, as Mr. Underhill sees it, is the almost total lack of any sense of the real meaning of purity which he seems to find among the young men and young women of the day. The argument which he quotes as to sex morals is simply appalling. But the most significant feature, I think, of the book is to be found in the emphasis laid on the need of education, genuine, Christian, and equal. The book should be read by anyone who has charge of young people, or who desires to understand the society as well as the dangers of today.

W. H. HUTTON.

BOOK NOTES

St Thomas of Canterbury. By Sidney Dark. Macmillan. 6s. Mr. Dark has done a great service by writing this "Life of a Saint." Becket is so far away from the modern world, and the historical problems connected with his struggle with the King are so intricate, that a purely scientific and historical study has every chance of remaining unread by the general reader. There is room for a book which treats him simply as a saint, such as the Middle Ages believed him to be. Mr Dark provides what is required with his accustomed skill. The great thing is that people should read Church History. If the presentment differs radically from preconceived opinions derived from school history books, so much the better; thought is stimulated all the more. Perhaps the concluding paragraph is a little overstated: "In the English Church, that he loved so well, St Thomas of Canterbury is again revered, and English men and English women do not forget to pray (the collect for St Thomas' Day follows)."

Some World Problems. By the Bishop of London. Longmans. 4s. These brief chapters, an expansion of the letters written to *The Times* by the Bishop during his world tour, are well calculated to bring the problems of Empire before readers who shrink from the labour of mastering statistics or detailed descriptions.

A Book of Devotional Readings from the Literature of Christendom, edited by J. M. Connell (Longmans. 5s.), appears opportunely in a second edition, for in the recently published letters of Baron von Hügel a high price is given to the book. Everything of importance is represented in this modestly priced book—the Fathers, Lives of the Saints, the Mystics, the Reformers, Modern Poets and Philosophers. It is admirably adapted to the requirements of a bedside book.

Wit and Wisdom of Dean Inge. Edited by Sir James Marchant. Longmans. 3s. 6d. Dean Inge's writings are so well known to our readers that no further notice of this volume of selections is required than a recommendation of it as a present to those who have not yet made the acquaintance of a writer who is at once a deep thinker and a consummate stylist.

The Passion of Saint Perpetua. An English translation. By R. W. Muncey. Dent. 3s. 6d. This tiny little book is prettily got up and will introduce the general reader very happily to a beautiful document. The notes are derived mainly from Dr Armitage Robinson's edition. The English is a little clumsy in places; for example: "Surely equally with these those ancient examples were destined sometime to be."

Anglo-Catholic Principles. By Bishop Chandler. Mowbray. 1s. This is a plainly but attractively written pamphlet the nature of which is well expressed by the author when he says: "Perhaps anyone who reads to the end of this essay may be inclined to say, Is that Anglo-Catholicism? Why, it looks just like the ordinary principles of the English Church." The Bishop gives definite guidance in an irenic form on the controverted questions of the day.

W. K. L. C.

FROM MOWBRAYS' AUTUMN LIST

FEED MY SHEEP. Essays in Pastoral Theology.

Edited by the Rev. FRANCIS UNDERHILL, M.A., Warden of Liddon House.
Cloth, 6s. (*Post*, 6d.)

"This volume should be possessed by every parish priest."—*Church Times*.

"The Warden of Liddon House has been fortunate in his coadjutors, and the volume before us is, in its range and in the freshness of its tone, thoroughly commendable. . . . We conclude with the hope that a volume so fresh and living as this will be read not only by the clergy but also by many of the laity."—*Guardian*.

THE YOUNG ENGLISHMAN.

By the Rev. FRANCIS UNDERHILL, Warden of Liddon House. Cloth, 4s. 6d.
(*Post*, 4½d.)

"Full of fresh and illuminating observation. . . . The value of the book lies in the intimate knowledge brought to bear on the life both of poor boys in mean streets and of the well-to-do in public schools. . . . On these and allied topics Mr. Underhill is always thoughtful and thought-provoking."—*The Times Literary Supplement*.

"Full of acute observation and some fundamental thought, and we cannot imagine any reader failing to become absorbed in its pages. . . . A most readable, and useful, and stimulating contribution to sociological study."—*Green Quarterly*.

RELIGIO LAICI. Essays on Religious, Social, and Philosophical Subjects.

By SIR HENRY SLESSER, K.C., M.P. Cloth, 4s. 6d. (*Post*, 3d.)

"Sir Henry Slessor has thought long and clearly on the great matters which he discusses, and we would express our appreciation of his virile profession of faith."—*The Times Literary Supplement*.

"In a materialistic and sensational age, we welcome these essays derived from a public life lived in a rarer and more bracing atmosphere."—*Spectator*.

COMFORT AND SURE CONFIDENCE. A New Book of Readings and Prayers for the Sick, together with Notes on Visiting the Sick.

By the Rev. ARTHUR W. HOPKINSON. Limp cloth for the pocket, round corners, 3s. 6d. (*Post*, 3d.)

"The author's earnestness and the simplicity of his language are beyond praise."—*Church Times*.

THE PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICE OF RETREAT.

By the Rev. ALAN H. SIMPSON, M.A., Canon Missioner, Diocese of Coventry ; Warden of the Retreat House, Rugby ; General Secretary to the Association for Promoting Retreats. Cloth, 3s. 6d. (*Post*, 2½d.)

A practical handbook on all matters connected with Retreats.

"Bears in mind the needs both of those who are contemplating going into Retreat and of the clergy who are being asked to act as conductors."—*The Times Literary Supplement*.

THE CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE. Being Simple Considerations for use in Retreat.

By the Rev. JAMES WAREHAM, Organizing Secretary of the Association for Promoting Retreats. With a Preface by the Rev. J. A. BOUQUET, Chaplain of All Saints' Hospital, Eastbourne. Cloth, 3s. (*Post*, 3d.)

"The prayers, addresses, outlines of meditations, brought together are marked by simplicity and directness."—*The Times Literary Supplement*.

"A really practical and workmanlike little book."—*Church Times*.

By the same Author.

AN ORDERED LIFE. Suggestions for the Making of a Rule.

3s. 6d. (*Post*, 3½d.)

"Full and sensible advice for the compiling of a rule of life, embracing not only rules for Prayer, Meditation, Almsgiving and Communion, but also for Repentance, Retreats and Work."—*Guardian*.

"An ideal book to give to new and old communicants."—*Church Times*.

THE NEW PRAYER BOOK. A Popular Account of its Provisions.

By the Rev. F. H. J. NEWTON, M.A., Vicar of Rickmansworth, author of "The Conduct of Public Worship," etc. 2s. 6d. (*Post*, 2d.)

"He has rendered a useful service in explaining and interpreting the proposals of the Bishops."—*Saturday Review*.

"Particularly valuable is his treatment of the alternative Communion Service. . . . Mr. Newton's book is full of information."—*Guardian*.

ANGLO-CATHOLIC PRINCIPLES. A Statement of the Fundamentals of the Anglo-Catholic Position.

By the Right Rev. ARTHUR CHANDLER, D.D., formerly Bishop of Bloemfontein. 1s. (*Post*, 1d.)

"Such a wise and grave statement of great themes as we might expect from the former Bishop of Bloemfontein."—*Guardian*.

SACRIFICE AND SACRAMENT.

By the Rev. E. O. JAMES, Ph.D., Vicar of St. Thomas's, Oxford. 1s. (*Post*, 1d.)

A discussion of some Eucharistic problems in the light of modern thought.

**A. R. MOWBRAY & CO., Ltd., 28, Margaret Street,
Oxford Circus, London, W. 1 ; and 9, High Street, Oxford.**

New SHELDON PRESS Books

PAOLO VERONESE: His Career and Work

By PERCY H. OSMUND. With 64 pages of illustrations. Cloth boards. 25s. net.

[The life and work of Paolo Veronese is treated here with the finished scholarship of a skilled critic. The most representative of his paintings have been carefully reproduced by a process that gives the pictures their full tonal value. The book fills a gap in the literature of art, for no large-scale monograph on the subject exists.]

PAPERS AND DIARIES OF A YORK FAMILY, 1764-1839.

By MRS. EDWIN GRAY. With 12 illustrations. Cloth-boards, 12s. 6d. net.

[The Gray family have lived under the shadow of the Minster for nearly two centuries. This family history illustrates very happily the daily life of an upper-class family with religious and philanthropic activities. Important persons such as Wilberforce and Hannah More cross the stage frequently.]

JEAN FRANÇOIS MILLET, 1814-1875

By MRS. LESLIE THOMSON. With 4 illustrations. Cloth boards. 2s. 6d. net.

[Millet's "Angelus" is one of the most famous pictures in the world. The artist's life, so sympathetically told here, is an inspiration and a moral tonic.]

THE STONE AGE

By E. O. JAMES, Ph.D., F.S.A. With numerous illustrations. Cloth boards. 3s. 6d. net.

[A well-known archaeologist gives the latest information about prehistoric man. The book is written in a popular style, and is calculated to interest readers of all ages and tastes.]

PIONEER WOMEN. Second Series.

HANNAH MORE, OCTAVIA HILL, MARY CARPENTER, AGNES JONES.

By MARGARET E. TABOR. Each, 6d. The four in a volume, cloth boards. 2s. 6d. net.

[Lives of women who have carved out new careers for their sex.]

BALLADS FOR ACTING

By V. B. LAWTON. Cloth boards. 2s. 6d. The Duke of Gordon's Daughter; The Heir of Linne; Lord Bateman; The Undaunted Female; The Barring of the Door. May be had separately. Each, 4d.

[MRS. PAGET, of Chester, writes: "MISS LAWTON has done a really good turn to all those who love a bit o' acting."]

A specially prepared list of simple Plays may be had post free.

FICTION

JACKSON'S JU-JU

By ARTHUR E. SOUTHON. Cloth boards. 2s. 6d. net.

[The many readers of "A Yellow Napoleon" will come to MR. SOUTHON'S new book with high expectations, which will not be disappointed. The atmosphere of the West African Bush is reproduced with uncanny skill—the white man at his worst and at his best, the strength of pagan superstition, physical sufferings and their alleviation by the skill of medical missionaries, and, above all, the power of the Gospel which brings light and life.]

SPLENDID NEW BOOKS FOR BOYS AND GIRLS

Capital Stories. Best Writers. Attractive Coloured Jackets. Good Bulk. Equal in value to any similar books on the market. Coloured list post free.

THE CAMP ACROSS THE ROAD. A simply told and charming Guide story. By H. B. DAVIDSON. 3s. net.

AN ISLAND FOR TWO. A school story full of adventure. By L. F. RAMSEY. 2s. 6d. net.

THE SEA RAIDERS. A capital story of exploits at sea. By A. B. SHERLOCK. 2s. 6d. net.

THE MYSTERY SCOUT. A fine yarn showing the perseverance and resourcefulness of Scouts. By E. LE BRETON MARTIN. 2s. 6d. net.

THE TRACK OF DANGER. By ALFRED JUDD. 2s. 6d. net.

Major Brand, his son Dick, and stalwart O'Flannel in New Adventures all round the Globe.

THE SHELDON PRESS

S.P.C.K. House, Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2

And of all Booksellers.

Lists post free.

Enquiries invited.

JUST PUBLISHED

CAN THESE BONES LIVE?

Modern Christianity, Social Life and the English Church.

By REV. J. WORSLEY BODEN. With a Preface by Rev. G. A. STUDDERT-KENNEDY, M.C., Chaplain to H.M. the King. 4s. 6d. net.

This is a book for the modern men and women, who move in the whirl of the world, but are yet interested in religion, and would rally to the Christian Church if they thought it was more alive and up to date. "These Bones" are the Church of England. The author, a London parson, who was a layman during the war, suggests some of the conditions, both theological and social, in which the dry bones can live and grow.

THE REUNION OF THE CHURCHES

A Study of Leibnitz and his Great Attempt.

By G. J. JORDAN, D.D. 12s. net.

Birmingham Post: "Dr. Jordan is proving one of our most stimulating writers, and the present volume adds to his reputation. It is a fine study put forward at an opportune moment."

CONSTABLE 10 ORANGE ST. W.C.2

THE HISTORIC MONUMENTS OF ENGLAND

Edited by A. HAMILTON THOMPSON, M.A., Hon. D.Litt. (Durham), F.S.A.,
Professor of Mediæval History in the University of Leeds.

THE PAINTED GLASS OF YORK.

An Account of the Mediæval Glass of the Minster and the Parish Churches. By the REV. F. HARRISON, M.A., F.S.A., Librarian of the Dean and Chapter Library, York. With a Preface by the VERY REV. W. FOXLEY NORRIS, D.D., Dean of Westminster. With four coloured Plates and numerous Illustrations. Cloth boards. 12s. 6d. net.

Of this timely volume the DEAN OF WESTMINSTER writes: "Mr. Harrison has devoted years of close and loving care and attention to the windows, and brought his considerable and unusual amount of antiquarian and archæological knowledge to bear upon them."

The Yorkshire Post says: "Full of valuable matter."

The Yorkshire Herald says: "... the really great work. ... The volume will delight its readers."

ENGLISH MONUMENTAL SCULPTURE SINCE THE RENAISSANCE.

By KATHARINE A. ESDAILE. With many Illustrations. 182 pp. Cloth boards. 10s. 6d. net.

[The writer boldly claims that the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century monuments in our churches are among the artistic glories of our land. The populace has always admired them, but the cultivated, awed by the prestige of the Gothic Revivalists, have scorned them. MRS. ESDAILE'S book writes a new page in the art history of our land.]

The volumes already published in this Series are

- "ENGLISH MEDIÆVAL GLASS." By J. D. LE COUTEUR.
- "THE CATHEDRAL CHURCHES OF ENGLAND." By PROF. A. HAMILTON THOMPSON.
- "PARISH CHURCH ARCHITECTURE." By the REV. E. TYRRELL GREEN.
Each, 8s. 6d. net.
- "SUNDIALS." By ARTHUR ROBERT GREEN. 10s. 6d. net.

S.P.C.K., LONDON

ENGLISH CHURCH UNION

THE ENGLISH CHURCH UNION still maintains the unique position which it has occupied for seventy years in the Catholic Movement.

It devotes its enormous resources to the steadfast defence of Catholic Doctrine and Discipline, and persists in upholding the claim of the Church of England to be an integral part of the whole Catholic Church of Christ.

It has devoted itself, through its Literature Committee, to the production of literature in all branches of Theology and Ethics.

Early next year it will publish a One Volume Catholic Commentary on the whole Bible, which ought to be of invaluable service to the cause.

The Union, through its Legal Committee and by means of its great financial resources, is able to afford counsel, protection and assistance to all persons, lay or clerical, who may be assailed in any spiritual matter.

In all its activities the Union seeks to co-operate with all other Catholic Societies, and looks forward hopefully to the day when all such Societies may be united and work together under one leadership for the support of Catholic Principles and Practice.

Conditions of Membership : Membership is open to all members of the Church of England and of Churches in Communion with her who are communicants, and the membership is graduated as follows : Full Members, 10/- a year ; Associates, 2/6 ; and Adherents, 1/-.

The Church Union Gazette is published monthly at the incredibly low price of 1/6 per annum, post free.

ARNOLD PINCHARD,

Secretary.

31, Russell Square, W.C. 1.